

The Review of English Studies

VOL. VIII.—No. 30.

APRIL 1932.

THE RELATIONS OF THE WELSH BARD IOLO MORGANWG WITH DR. JOHNSON, COWPER AND SOUTHEY

By HERBERT G. WRIGHT

ONE of the most remarkable Welshmen of the eighteenth century was Edward Williams, better known by his bardic name of Iolo Morganwg. Before speaking of his relations with Dr. Johnson, Cowper and Southey, it may perhaps be well to say something of his history and personality. A stonemason by trade, he early developed a passion for literature and a gift for writing both in English and Welsh. In later years he devoted himself to the study of old Welsh literature and formed an important collection of manuscripts. His reputation as a scholar and antiquary stood high among his contemporaries. Recent investigations have cast a cloud over him, for it has been shown that Iolo had a share in spreading various ideas about bardism which lack any historical foundation and, in particular, the institution known as the *Gorsedd*, or assembly of the bards, which accompanies a Welsh *eisteddfod*, is attributed to his inventive powers. He is also charged, not unlike Macpherson and Chatterton, with having written poems in the manner of Dafydd ap Gwilym and then ascribed them to that medieval bard.

Whatever one may think of such fabrications, it cannot be asserted that Iolo was guilty of any mercenary aim. All his life he remained a poor scholar, absorbed in the pursuit of his studies. Another aspect of his idealism is seen in his hatred of slavery. His brothers,

who had emigrated to Jamaica and prospered in their craft, wished to make him an allowance. But in spite of his poverty, Iolo refused to accept money which had been earned in a land of slaves and similarly declined the property bequeathed to him on his brothers' death. Holding such views, on the outbreak of the French Revolution, he naturally became one of its ardent supporters. He was spied upon and his papers were taken to London, where he was summoned before Pitt to give an account of himself. He had previously had an interview with Pitt about other business and on this occasion, after receiving a kindly warning, he was permitted to return home. However, he would not take his papers with him but insisted on their being returned by those who had seized them. Iolo displayed the same steadfastness when, being allowed to present an epithalamium to the Prince of Wales, the future George IV, he appeared at court in the insignia of his craft, a leather apron and a trowel. It says something for the prince that he tolerated this and also that in 1794 he let Iolo dedicate his poems to him, volumes which were not free from satirical remarks about monarchs in the abstract.

The list of subscribers to these poems is an amazing one and gives some idea of the singularity of the author. It includes some forty-five members of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, sixteen fellows, the Principals of Jesus College and St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and the Dean of Christ Church, as well as the Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and the Public Orator of that University; a duke and a duchess, with numerous lords and ladies and country gentry; five bishops and many clergymen and ministers; a sprinkling of generals and merchants as well as schoolmasters and apothecaries. In addition to famous Welsh men of letters like Paul Panton and Thomas Pennant, we encounter the names of Mrs. Barbauld, Mrs. Montague, Hannah More, Anna Seward, Christopher Anstey, Thomas Bowdler, Charles and Miss Burney, Francis Douce and Vicesimus Knox. Robert Raikes, the founder of Sunday schools, appears along with Horne Tooke and Dr. Priestley; Mr. Thomas Paine rubs shoulders with — Paine, Esq., Secretary to the Prince of Wales; Citoyen Brissot and Citoyen Jansen stand side by side with Mr. Chateau and Mr. Gratiot of St. Louis, Louisiana; Governor Pownall and the Hon. Thomas Pownall of Quebec, James Jones of New York and Dr. Samuel Jones of Lower Dublin, Pennsylvania, are there as well as Thomas Pinckney, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America and General Washington himself. To these names must

be added William Bowles, Generalissimo of the Greek Nation, HUMANITY'S WILBERFORCE, and Iolo's three Jamaican brothers, Thomas, Miles and John, whose callings of sculptor and bricklayer are faithfully recorded by the democratic poet.

Two other names in the list, those of Mrs. Piozzi and James Boswell, point to a connection with the Johnson circle. With Johnson himself Iolo was not intimate, for they met but once and the meeting proved a failure. It is impossible to state precisely when it occurred, for Elijah Waring, to whom we owe our knowledge of the incident, gives no information on this point. He indicates, however, that it was during the period of Iolo's residence in London, which would place it in the years 1770 to 1773, or somewhere about 1777, when he returned to London after a stay in Kent.¹ The young stonemason, who was eager to improve his acquaintance with the English language and in general to extend his reading, used to call on a bookseller who had been helpful to him. One day, says Waring, "he was occupying a leisure hour, and quiet corner, in this mental banqueting-room, when a large ungraceful man entered the shop, and seating himself abruptly by the counter, began to inspect some books and pamphlets lying there. This austere-looking personage, held the books almost close to his face, as he turned over the leaves rapidly, and the Bard thought petulantly; then replaced them on the counter, and finally gave the whole a stern kind of shove out of his way, muttering as he rose, 'The trash of the day, I see!' then, without another word or sign of recognition to the bookseller, rolled himself out of the shop." After his departure, Iolo asked who the bluff gentleman might be. On hearing that it was the famous Dr. Johnson, he wished that he had known it before, for then he might have mustered up courage to speak to him. The bookseller assured him that if he returned on the first day of the following month, he could count on meeting Johnson, who made periodical visits to see the new publications.

Iolo, who was eager to hear Johnson converse, came again on the appointed day and in order to have an excuse for addressing Johnson, asked the bookseller for a good English grammar, when several were placed before him. What followed is told thus by Waring:

Selecting three of these grammars, he walked boldly up to Johnson, introducing himself, as he said "with his best bow," but also with habitual

¹ Cf. Edward Williams, *Poems, Lyrical and Pastoral*, London, 1794, vol. I, xvi-xvii.

frankness, as a poor Welsh mechanic smitten with the love of learning, and particularly anxious to become a proficient in the English language. He then presented his three grammars, soliciting the favour of Dr. Johnson's advice which of them to choose; observing that the judgment of such a masterly writer, must be the most valuable he could possibly obtain. Johnson either disregarded this really graceful compliment to him as a model author, or he was in an ungracious temper . . . for taking the volumes into his hands, he cast an equivocal look, between a glance and a scowl, at the humble stranger before him, hastily turned over the several title pages, then surveyed him from head to foot, with an expression rather contemptuous than inquisitive; and thrusting back the grammars in his huge fist, rather at the inquirer than towards him, delivered this oracular reply, "*Either of them will do for you, young man!*" The emphatic *you* was a spark upon tinder—"I felt," said the Bard, "my Welsh blood mount to my forehead, thinking he meant to insult my humble station, and my poverty; so I retorted with some asperity, as I took back the grammars, *Then, Sir, to make sure of having the best, I will buy them all*; and turning to my good friend the bookseller, I demanded the price, paid the money, though at the time I could ill spare it, and quitted the shop, far less pleased with Dr. Johnson, than with his writings."

Iolo retained the three grammars until his death, and when he referred to them, would often say "Aye! this is one of the Dr. Johnson grammars."

The Welsh bard afterwards made the acquaintance of Boswell and told him of this interview. Boswell, perhaps remembering his own feelings when he first met Johnson at the house of Davies the bookseller, expressed his regret that it should have ended so abruptly, remarking that Iolo might ultimately have won Johnson's favour, if he had endured his rudeness patiently.¹ But Iolo was high-spirited, sensitive and self-reliant. He spoke of himself as possessing the warm pride of an ancient Briton and independence of mind.² A man of this temper would not submit tamely to rudeness, not even from the object of his intense respect and admiration, Dr. Johnson.

Among the subscribers to the *Poems* of 1794 we also find William Cowper. It was through his friend Samuel Rose that Iolo Morganwg was brought together with the poet in the autumn of 1792. That year Mary Unwin had had a second stroke and in the hope of restoring her health Cowper returned to the world after living as a

¹ Cf. Elijah Waring, *Recollections of Edward Williams, the Bard of Glamorgan; or, Iolo Morganwg*, London, 1850, pp. 25-28.

² *Poems*, xix.

recluse for well-nigh thirty years. Together they left Weston and journeyed to Earham in Sussex, where they passed a few weeks with William Hayley. After an initial improvement, however, it became clear that Mrs. Unwin was no better, and so in September she set out for home with Cowper. They spent a night at Kingston and reached Rose's dwelling in Chancery Lane at ten o'clock the following morning. Waring explains that at this time Iolo was under suspicion of being a dangerous democrat, in league with the revolutionary party, and when Rose invited him, he was afraid that it might be a design to entrap him. However, he decided to go and, as was his wont, to rely on his integrity and express his views freely.

On joining the little party assembled, he found himself in prepossessing company, and would have instantly felt perfectly at ease, but for one silent gentleman who sat at the corner of the fireplace, taking no part in the conversation, though evidently attending to it. There was an expression of quiet melancholy overshadowing this silent man's intellectual countenance, which particularly interested him; yet he could not divest himself of a suspicion, that the observant mute was placed there, to watch his words on behalf of the government. Conversation flowed freely upon various topics, some of them better understood by the Bard than by any one else in the company, such as the Bardic Institutions and native literature of Wales, upon which his eloquence was unailing, and his enthusiasm unbounded. The time for separating, however, soon arrived, and Mr. Rose then took him aside, to inform him that their uncommunicative friend was no other than the celebrated William Cowper, who, having heard of his acquirements, was desirous of knowing him; but now the opportunity had arrived, the nervously sensitive poet was unable to encounter either an introduction, or any active share in the conversation; though he had evidently been an attentive listener, and Mr. Rose said was certainly much interested. A hope was also expressed, that the English poet and the Welsh Bard might yet have a more sociable meeting; but they met no more in this world.¹

That was unfortunately true, for at the time of this brief visit to London, Cowper was on the brink of the last great crisis in his life and the mental unrest which he felt even then was reflected in his conduct. Always nervous of meeting strangers, he had on this occasion a stronger reason for holding aloof. He was burdened with the thought that his journey had failed in its aim and the distress was beginning to pierce him which in 1793 found vent in the pathetic lines addressed to Mary Unwin.

It is a matter for regret that the meetings of so unusual a character

¹ Waring, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-43.

as Iolo Morganwg with Dr. Johnson and Cowper, though for very different reasons, should not have led to a closer connection. There was much in his character that must have appealed to them—his devotion to his mother, his hatred of slavery and oppression, his unselfish generosity and his idealistic quest of learning.¹ Whereas these meetings have only an anecdotal significance, Iolo's relations with Southey are of greater importance. We can readily understand that Southey should be attracted to one who had run a course in some ways resembling his own, beginning with a keen admiration of the French Revolution and afterwards recoiling from its excesses. Moreover, the author of *The Battle of Blenheim* had clearly much in common with such an apostle of peace as was Iolo. At any rate, when he refers to him in his correspondence, it is with a note of personal affection. Thus, in 1804, on one of his periodical visits to London, he writes to his wife: "Bard Williams is in town, so I shall shake one honest man by the hand, whom I did not expect to see,"² and in 1827, shortly after the death of Iolo, he sadly observes to Henry Taylor:

My old acquaintance (those, I mean, who were elders when I was a young man) are dropping on all sides. One very remarkable one is just gone to his rest after a pilgrimage of fourscore years. . . . He was the most eccentric man I ever knew, in whose eccentricity there was no affectation, and in whose conduct there was nothing morally wrong. Poor fellow! with a wild head and a warm heart, he had the simplicity of a child and the tenderness of a woman, and more knowledge of the traditions and antiquities of his own country than it is to be feared will ever be possessed by any one after him.³ I could tell you some odd anecdotes of him which ought not to be lost."⁴

One of these anecdotes is contained in a letter from Southey

¹ After the death of Iolo in December 1826, Waring contributed his reminiscences to *The Cambrian* newspaper in a series of letters, which he sent to Southey. On one point Southey was able to correct him, for Waring had said that Iolo met Cowper at a tea-party after the publication of the *Poems, Lyric and Pastoral*. In his life of Cowper (1836, vol. III, p. 94 note), Southey pointed out that Cowper was never in London after leaving it in 1763, except for one morning in September 1792; and so both the date and the hour mentioned by Waring were impossible. When his reminiscences appeared as a book, Waring admitted the error. In one respect both he and Southey appear to be at fault. They say that at the time the meeting occurred, Iolo was still a stonemason in London. According to the preface to Iolo's *Poems* of 1794 (vol. I, xvii) he left London for Wales in 1777, and was therefore not resident in the capital in 1792.

² Southey, *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. II, p. 284.

³ Cf. Southey's life of Cowper (1836), vol. III, p. 94 note, where he says: "It grieves me to think what curious knowledge, and how much of it, has probably perished with poor old Edward Williams!"

⁴ Southey, *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. V, p. 285.

to Waring. It describes how the bard collected all the seeds of the tea-plant which he could obtain and sowed them about the Glamorganshire hills, in the hope that they might flourish and render the import of tea from China superfluous.¹ Other anecdotes were noted down by Southey with the intention of using them in the *Letters from England of Don Espriella*. Among them we find Iolo's anti-monarchical toast in triad form: "The three securities of liberty. All Kings in hell; the door locked; the key lost." This clearly dates back to his revolutionary period, as does the following account of his activities as a bookseller:

When Edward Williams kept a bookseller's shop at Cowbridge, his seditious celebrity soon spread abroad. His circulating catalogue was indeed curious, the Reflections on the French Revolution were entered as the Gospel according to St. Burke; and a collection of Jacobinical pamphlets as Directions for Duck-milking, a title which made all the Welsh farmers send for the book. A son of Alderman Curtis resolved to punish the honest old bard, and went in to ask for the Gospel according to St. Burke. The book was out, but Williams had a new copy, which he offered. "No," said Curtis, "this is Burke's Reflections, and what I want is the Gospel according to St. Burke." "Indeed, sir," said Williams, "it is the same book." Curtis said he was going out of town, and had not time to read it. The poor Welchman offered to lend it him for some days. At this time a man who was the spy of government, self-elected to the office in that town, came in, "By God, Mr. Curtis, we will have it!" and "By God, Mr. Spy," said Iolo, "you shall not." Curtis was now looking every where for some sin against government, and his eye caught a book labelled Rights of Man. "What's the price of this?" "Five shillings." He threw down the money. This shall go to Billy Pitt, and he shook it in triumph at the bard. But when he opened the book, his countenance changed, and he exclaimed, "Damn the rascal—the Bible, by God!"²

When Waring, as has already been mentioned, sent his reminiscences to Southey, a correspondence ensued which affirmed the esteem in which Southey held Iolo for his moral and intellectual worth. It also brought to light a narrative which Iolo had given to Southey about 1804, as being a popular tale in Glamorgan. On receiving the tale, Southey, knowing how little was to be expected from Iolo in any regular undertaking, entreated him not to let the stores of tradition, which he had collected, perish with him. He begged him to put down anything he remembered just as it came and when he had filled a sheet to forward it to Southey who, when

¹ Waring, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

² Southey, *Commonplace Book*, ed. Warter, 1850, vol. IV, p. 364.

enough material had been brought together, would arrange and prepare it for the press. This offer was made at the house of Sharon Turner, who added his request to that of Southey. Iolo promised to do so but, with his constitutional incapacity for anything systematic, he never did. Southey thanked Waring for the cuttings from *The Cambrian*, containing his recollections, and expressed his intention to have them bound in a volume to accompany his set of Iolo's poems. At the sale of the Poet Laureate's library these volumes, with an autograph title-page to the supplementary volume, were purchased by a Bristol bookseller and subsequently acquired by the Neath Philosophical Institution. The following sonnet was inscribed in the third volume in 1837:

Southey, thy honour'd name inscribe we now
 With good old Iolo's, and his humbler fame:
 Nor would thy noble genius think it shame;
 For he was great of mind, and did not bow
 To Gold the idol, or Earth's worship'd fools;
 But lived in God's free sunshine, e'en as Thou.
 True, ye glean'd wisdom in far different schools,
 Yet when the dirge from Keswick's mountain shore,
 Told of thy liberty from mortal thrall,
 There came with it a spirit, that upbore
 My thoughts to that pure element, where all
 Such glorious spirits mingle, never more
 Of schools or sects to dream—while Truth's award
 Link'd England's laureate with Glamorgan's bard.¹

Southey knew full well the value of Iolo's knowledge and was often anxious to consult him. The great difficulty was always to maintain contact with him. In a letter written in 1808 he cries despairingly: "Bard Williams is God knows where and nothing is to be got out of him except by word of mouth."² Nevertheless, so highly did he value Iolo that he sought his advice, even on matters about which the opinion of another famous Welsh scholar, William Owen, was more readily available.³ When writing *Madoc*, he had

¹ Cf. Waring, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-90. It appears that these volumes perished in a fire subsequent to the publication of Waring's book.

² Southey, *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. III, p. 188.

³ On January 10, 1806, Southey writes that William Owen and Edward Williams had advised him about the pronunciation and scansion of the Welsh names in *Madoc* (unpublished letter to Wynn in the National Library of Wales), and on November 16, 1807, he says that in preparing his edition of the *Morte d'Arthur* he will seek the aid of both these scholars (*Life and Correspondence of Southey*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. III, p. 116). At the beginning of section 11 in Part I of *Madoc* occurs the following description of the *Gorsedd* or assembly of the bards:

The place of meeting was a high hill-top,
 Nor bowered with trees, nor broken by the plough,
 Remote from human dwellings, and the stir

good cause to discuss the poem with Iolo, for the latter had taken great interest in the legend of Madoc's adventures. Indeed, so firmly did he believe in the existence of Welsh-speaking descendants of Madoc in America that he determined to explore for himself, and in order to inure himself to the hardships of a pioneer he lived for a time wholly in fields and woods, exposed to all weathers, and sleeping on the ground or in trees.¹ Southey received his approval of the use made of Welsh names in *Madoc*, and also drew liberally

Of human life, and open to the breath
And to the eye of Heaven. In days of yore,
There had the circling stones been planted ; there,
From earliest ages, the primeval lore,
From Bard to Bard, with reverence handed down.
They whom to wonder, or the love of song,
Or reverence of their fathers' ancient rites,
Led thither, stood without the ring of stones.
Cyveilioc entered to the initiate Bards,
Himself, albeit his hands were stained with war,
Initiate ; for the Order in the lapse
Of years, and in their nation's long decline,
From the first rigour of their purity
Somewhat had fallen. The Masters of the Song
In azure robes were robed, that one bright hue
To emblem unity, and peace, and truth,
Like Heaven, that o'er a world of wickedness
Spreads its eternal canopy serene.
The bards of Britain there, a noble band,
Within the Stones of Federation stood,
On the green turf, and under the blue sky,
Their heads in reverence bare, and bare of foot.
There, in the eye
Of light, and in the face of day, the rites
Began. Upon the Stone of Covenant
The sheathed sword was laid ; the Master then
Raised up his voice, and cried, Let them who seek
The high degree and sacred privilege
Of Bardic science, and of Cimbric lore,
Here to the Bards of Britain make their claim !
Thus having said, the Master bade the youths
Approach the place of peace, and merit there
The Bard's most honourable name : At that,
Heirs and transmitters of the ancient light,
The youths advanced ; they heard the Cimbric lore,
From earliest days preserved ; they struck their harps,
And each in due succession raised the song.

In his notes Southey explains that for this description he had read the account in William Owen's introduction to his translation of *Llywarch Hên* and that to ensure complete accuracy, both Owen and Edward Williams had looked over his lines. With the above passage may be compared another in Southey's *Sir Thomas More* (2nd ed., 1831, vol. I, pp. 41-42). Speaking of the Druid circle near Keswick, the author quotes from his account of the *Gorsedd* and points out that "the site [of the circle] precisely accords with the description which Edward Williams and William Owen give of the situation required for such meeting places."

¹ Waring, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

on the information contained in Iolo's poems, as may be seen from the notes to the epic. A letter to Coleridge, dated June 11, 1804, states that Southey likewise derived from Bard Williams "some fine arcana of bardic mythology," quite new to him and to the world, which Coleridge would find in *Madoc*.¹ It is highly probable that the passage referred to is the lay of the chief bard in Part I, Section 2.

Thee, Lord ! he sung,
 Father ! the eternal ONE ! whose wisdom, power,
 And love, . . . all love, all power, all wisdom thou !
 Nor tongue can utter, nor can heart conceive.
 He in the lowest depth of Being framed
 The imperishable mind ; in every change,
 Through the great circle of progressive life,
 He guides and guards, till evil shall be known,
 And, being known as evil, cease to be ;
 And the pure soul, emancipate by Death,
 The Enlarger, shall attain its end predoomed,
 The eternal newness of eternal joy.

However, if these are the lines to which Southey alluded, he was mistaken in regarding as new to the world the "arcana of bardic mythology" on which they are based, for these had been printed in Edward Williams's poems.

As a tribute to the bard, Southey introduced him into *Madoc*, an honour which he bestowed on no other contemporary, not even on his friend Wynn, to whom he was in so many ways deeply indebted. In the eighth section of Part I he therefore appears as :

Iolo, old Iolo, he who knows
 The virtue of all herbs of mount or vale,
 Or greenwood shade, or quiet brooklet's bed ;
 Whatever lore of science, or of song,
 Sages and Bards of old have handed down.²

¹ Southey, *Life and Correspondence*, ed. C. C. Southey, vol. II, p. 293.

² Cf. Waring, *op. cit.* p. 87. On March 14, 1827, Southey wrote to Waring : "Perhaps he [Iolo] never knew that—with that sort of license which allows the introduction of a living portrait in a historical picture relating to other times—Some lines of *Madoc* were intended as a memorial of my respect for him. They are in the eighth section of the first part."

THE LENGTH OF ELIZABETHAN AND JACOBEAN PLAYS

By A. HART

So many contradictory opinions have recently been expressed on the normal length of the unabridged Elizabethan play written for the public stage that it seems worth while to state the facts. The modern opinion that this length was about 3,000 lines springs from an unwarranted extension to all plays of a result obtained by Fleay¹ for the plays of Shakespeare. He used the Globe edition, which gives higher totals than any other edition that I have seen, arranged his figures in descending order of magnitude, excluded the eight lowest totals from the count—four of these it would seem because they were short—and under these factitious conditions found that the average length of the remaining twenty-nine plays was 3,000 lines. Arithmetic was not Fleay's forte; his own figures prove that the average should have been 3,053 lines. Sir E. K. Chambers² has taken the trouble of re-counting these figures, and excluded six "abnormal" plays—two only of these are among Fleay's rejects; he finds that the average length of the thirty-one "normal" plays is 2,920 lines. Fleay's average for the thirty-seven plays is 2,860 lines; Sir E. K. Chambers makes it 2,864. These two results are extraordinarily close together considering that Fleay made errors varying from 20 to 900 lines in the various totals of no less than seventeen plays. My own figures, based on the text of the Cambridge edition of 1863-1866, make the average for the thirty-seven plays 2,751 lines a play. Fleay's totals have been quoted by authors for nearly sixty years; recent critics have accepted Fleay's² "proof" that normal, unabridged plays of Shakespeare average 3,000 lines in length, and have added, without any further appeal to figures, a corollary that normal Elizabethan plays average 3,000 lines in length. Professor J. D. Wilson³ has no doubts. "Something about 3,000 lines," he says, "seems to have been the normal length of a drama to

¹ *Shakespeare Manual* (1818), p. 259.

² *William Shakespeare* (1930), vol. ii, pp. 398-405.

³ *The Hamlet Transcript* (1918), p. 38.

which an Elizabethan audience was accustomed"; he repeats this in the New Shakespeare: ¹ "The normal length of a play for the London stage in Elizabethan days was about 3,000 lines; the received text of *The Two Gentlemen* contains some 2,380 lines. After what has just been said it should not be difficult to believe that at least 600 lines of the original have disappeared." Hence alarums and excursions in pursuit of the missing lines. Dr. W. W. Greg ² is more conservative and suggests that 2,400 to 2,500 lines "would be a moderately long play." Mr. G. B. Harrison, ³ in his introduction to a reprint of the first quarto of *Hamlet*, says: "Q 1 contains 2,143 lines, and the addition of a quarter would make the length of the original play about 2,780 lines; the average length of an Elizabethan play being about 2,800-3,000 lines." Professor L. L. Schücking ⁴ has his doubts whether acting versions ever exceeded 2,600 lines. The most recent references appear in Sir E. K. Chambers's *William Shakespeare*. ⁵ In discussing abridgments, he says, "Court entertainments often lasted for three hours, and a full length play of 3,000 lines would not require more."

The doctors disagree, as is usual, but, by their leave, an average is not a matter of opinion but of arithmetic. The critics are guessing, and the guess is a bad one; yet the material for finding the correct answer to the question, How long was the unabridged Elizabethan play, has always been ready to our hand. If we are prepared to count the total number of lines in all the plays written for the public stage during the years 1590-1616 we shall have the correct average. As my custom had always been to add up the lines of every play as I read it, I was led to make a complete tally of the lines in all the plays acted on the public stage during the years when Shakespeare was associated with the theatre. I have counted the number of lines in 233 plays, which include all but two of the extant plays known to have been written for or acted on the public stage during the years 1590-1616. I have used the list of plays arranged in chronological order by Sir E. K. Chambers. ⁶ Two plays have been omitted

¹ *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1921), p. 81.

² *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, p. 310, n.

³ Bodley Head Quartos, *Hamlet* (1923), p. xxvi.

⁴ *Times Literary Supplement*, September 22, 1930.

⁵ *William Shakespeare* (1930), vol. i, pp. 214-15. [To this should now be added Professor L. L. Schücking's *Zum Problem der Überlieferung des Hamlet-Textes*, 1931 (see pp. 228-31 below), which appeared after Mr. Hart's article reached England.—Ed. R.E.S.]

⁶ *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. iv, Appendix L, pp. 379-97, and Appendix N, pp. 404-406.

because they are not in the Melbourne Public Library. Latin plays, English translation of classical and French plays, University and the so-called "Closet" plays have been excluded, as have been all plays printed after 1616 unless we have evidence sufficient to prove that they were written or acted not later than that year.

Something must be said on the method of counting which has been adopted. A uniform edition of all Elizabethan and Jacobean plays does not exist, and is a desideratum; consequently the totals of lines obtained for the plays of one dramatist are too frequently not comparable with the totals obtained for the plays of another. If we use Fairholt's edition of Lyly's plays *Endimion* runs to 2,407 lines, which in Bond's edition are reduced to 2,082 lines. The difference of 325 lines for this short play might easily exceed 600 lines for two texts of such a Gargantuan prose play as *Bartholomew Fair*. Two editors of a play in blank verse usually agree closely in the totals recorded; there will always be room for small differences amounting to a few lines. Consistency in totals is ensured if we count as one line the two, three or more parts into which it may be broken in dialogue. My own totals for the plays in verse which are printed in facsimile of the original editions differ considerably from those obtained by the editors; it is their practice to count as a line whatever had been printed as a line in the first quartos, and they thus add to their totals the scene and stage directions. The length of *Macbeth* in the first folio is 2,396 lines, which the Cambridge editors reduce to 2,084 lines; Mr. Lucas's recent edition of the *Duchess of Malfi* runs to 3,316 lines; counting full metrical lines only, I make the total 3,037 lines.

More than one-half of the extant plays written by Shakespeare's contemporaries are in verse or contain very little prose; and thus for purposes of counting we are independent of the edition in which the text is printed. Furthermore, short tests have shown that the average word-content of an Elizabethan blank-verse line varies very little whoever may be the author, and that a line may be taken to contain as an average almost exactly eight words. The difficulty of standardising the length of the plays of Shakespeare in which much prose is present recurs and is intensified in any attempt to do the same for the plays of his contemporaries. Counting is tedious drudgery; too much of it is "tolerable and not to be endured," and would overtax the proverbial patience of the Chinese. Fortunately, results accurate enough for the purpose of this investigation are

obtainable without any excessive labour. I have shown¹ that on the average 100 lines of prose in the Cambridge edition (1863-1866) of Shakespeare's plays contain 818 words, and consequently we may assert, without falling into any serious error, that the average prose line of this edition has the same word-content as the line of blank verse. We may thus give a semi-quantitative meaning to the statement that *The Merry Wives* contains 2,634 lines, implying that these lines, prose or verse, average eight words to the line. The "full" prose line of the Cambridge text as it appears in long and continuous passages of prose speech averages very nearly eleven words a line. After making a considerable number of short tests, I found that if the "full" prose lines of the text of any dramatist's plays average eleven words to the line I could safely infer that the average word-content of his prose line—dialogue or speech—would come out a little more than eight words to the line. I have used, therefore, when I could find them, editions of dramatists in which the "full" prose line averaged as closely as possible eleven words to the line. The range of choice in the editions of the old dramatists varies considerably; where several editions are available I have chosen the one in which the prose text approximates most clearly to the conditions stated above. Of many plays, however, only one or two editions exist, and I have been compelled to admit to my lists totals comparatively too great or too small.

I give in Table I a list of the editions used, the number of the plays included, and the value in words of the full prose line of each edition.

I have divided the 201 plays into three groups. The first contains 107 plays; the totals for these would require little or no adjustment if the editions named are used. The second group of fifty plays consists of plays in which the "full" prose line averages less than eleven words to the line. The totals for each of these plays will be, in a comparative sense, too high, and would raise the average length of all the plays. As a rough measure of the consequent increase it may be noted that the average length of the thirty-three plays of Shakespeare which contain prose is 2,759 lines in the Cambridge text—eleven words to the "full" prose line, and 2,885 lines in the Globe text—"full" prose line of nine words; the difference amounts to 126 lines a play. Most of the texts of plays in the second group average ten words to the "full" prose line,

¹ *Review of English Studies*, viii, 29, January, 1932.

LENGTH OF ELIZABETHAN & JACOBEAN PLAYS 143

and this difference of 126 lines a play would probably be halved. The third group is smaller than the other two and contains the plays in which the "full" prose line exceeds eleven words; in this group the totals will be, comparatively, too low, and would tend to decrease the average length of all the plays. The increase in average length due to the second group would be cancelled in part by the decrease due to the third group. My results are therefore perhaps a little too high—but not, according to my estimate, more than twenty lines a play.

TABLE I
AVERAGE NUMBER OF WORDS IN FULL PROSE LINE

Group.	Name of dramatist.	Number of plays.	Edition or editors.	Average number of words.
1.	Shakespeare	37	Clark and Wright	11
	Jonson	3	Herford and Simpson	11
	Jonson	8	Various editions	11
	Chapman	12	Parrott	11
	Various authors	15	Dodsley (1780)	11
	Marlowe	7	Bullen	10½
	Peele	3	Bullen	10½
	Marston	9	Bullen	10½
	Middleton	13	Bullen	10½
2.	Day	5	Bullen	9½
	Heywood	13	Pearson's reprint	10
	Dekker	11	Pearson's reprint	10
	Various authors	10	Hazlitt's Dodsley	10
	Various authors	5	Mermaid series	10½
	Various authors	6	Bullen	9½
3.	Greene	6	Collins	11½
	Lyly	3	Bond	12
	Webster	3	Lucas	11½
	Beaumont and Fletcher	17	Waller	12
	Various authors	15	Malone Society re-prints	12½

It is not suggested that a solution has been found for all the troublesome problems involved in an attempt to make comparable the totals obtained for plays of different authors which are printed in a variety of editions; all that is claimed is that a definite and almost quantitative meaning has been given to the phrase "a line of dramatic prose," and that the length of any play may therefore be directly compared with the average length of Shakespeare's plays,

as computed on the text of the Cambridge edition (1863-1866). The average length of plays given below is approximately correct, and is certainly not understated. In the following table are included all plays intended for the London stage which were printed or are known to have been acted within the limits of the periods indicated at the head of each column.

TABLE II
PLAYS ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THEIR LENGTHS FOR VARIOUS GROUPS
OF YEARS

Number of lines.	Number of Plays acted or written during						
	I. 1590 to 1594.	II. 1594 to 1603.	III. 1590 to 1603.	IV. 1603 to 1616.	V. 1594 to 1616.	VI. 1590 to 1616.	VII. ¹ 1590 to 1616.
Over 3,400	1	4	5	3	7	8	0
3,200-3,400	0	0	0	5	5	5	0
3,000-3,200	1	4	5	11	15	16	7
Totals above 3,000	2	8	10	19	27	29	7
2,800-3,000	1	8	9	11	19	20	15
2,600-2,800	4	16	20	21	37	41	35
2,500-2,600	4	4	8	14	18	22	15
2,400-2,500	4	5	9	11	16	20	19
2,300-2,400	2	0	2	12	12	14	13
2,200-2,300	2	0	2	10	10	12	11
2,000-2,200	5	8	13	14	22	27	23
1,800-2,000	7	2	9	5	7	14	14
1,600-1,700	6	5	11	3	8	14	13
Below 1,600	11	2	13	7	9	20	20
Totals under 3,000	46	50	96	108	158	204	178
Totals	48	58	106	127	185	233	185
Corrupt or abridged ..	12	2	14	4	6	18	18
Sound Texts	36	56	92	123	179	215	167

A glance at the above table is sufficient to disprove finally and completely the oft-repeated assertion that the normal length of the Elizabethan or Jacobean play was about 3,000 lines. Not at any period, neither before the plague of 1592-1593 nor between 1594

¹ VII.—Total plays excluding Shakespeare's and Jonson's.

and the death of Elizabeth nor between the accession of James and the death of Shakespeare did more than a negligible percentage of plays written for the London stage exceed 3,000 lines. Not one-eighth of extant plays reach the normal length postulated by recent critics. Up to 1603 Shakespeare and Jonson contributed all but one of these out-size dramas, and from 1590-1616 twenty-two out of a total of twenty-nine. At least forty dramatists shared in the 185 plays not written by Shakespeare or Jonson; seven plays only exceed 3,000 lines, or less than 4 per cent.¹ The supply of these Gargantuan dramas ceased almost immediately after the death of Shakespeare, and the almost simultaneous retirement of Jonson from active practice as a playwright; after 1616 such plays ceased to be written. The 3,000-line play came in with Shakespeare and went out with him, yet it is not his "normal" play; if he has eleven plays above, he has twenty-six below this limit.

We have now to find the average length of the Elizabethan play. For this purpose we may use the figures given in the table, in the final row giving the totals of "Sound Texts," picking out a point in each column above which the number of plays is as nearly as possible equal to the number of plays below. The length of the middle play of each column will be approximately the average length of all the plays in the column. The following are the adjusted results.

TABLE III
MEAN LENGTH OF PLAYS AT DIFFERENT PERIODS

Column.	Period.	Number of plays.	Mean length.
I	1590-1594	36	2,250
II.	1594-1603	56	2,650
III.	1590-1603	92	2,500
IV.	1603-1616	123	2,520
V.	1594-1616	185	2,560
VI.	1590-1616	215	2,515
VII. ²	1590-1616	167	2,440

¹ My list credits Dekker with two plays, *The Honest Whore*, Parts I and II, each about 3,000 lines. The count was made on the texts of Pearson's edition, in which the full prose line averages about ten words. About one-half of each play is in prose, and I estimate that on the amount of prose present at least 100 lines should be deducted from the total of each play, if it is to be made strictly comparable with those obtained from the Cambridge text of Shakespeare's plays.

² Excludes the plays of Shakespeare and Jonson.

TABLE IV
COMPUTED AVERAGE LENGTH OF PLAYS FOR YEARS STATED

Period.	Number of plays.	Total lines.	Average per play.	Estimated average.
1590-1594	48	98,617	2,054	2,000
	12 (corrupt)	17,752	1,478	
	36	80,865	2,246	
	5 (Shakespeare's)	14,002	2,800	
	31	66,863	2,157	
1594-1603	58	150,029	2,588	2,650
	2 (corrupt)	2,913	1,457	
	56	147,116	2,627	
	4 (Jonson's)	15,592	3,898	
	52	131,524	2,531	
1590-1603	19 (Shakespeare's)	51,353	2,703	2,433
	33	80,271	2,432	
	106	248,646	2,347	
	14 (corrupt)	20,665	1,476	
	92	227,981	2,479	
1603-1616	4 (Jonson's)	15,592	3,898	2,500
	88	212,389	2,415	
	24 (Shakespeare's)	65,352	2,723	
	64	147,037	2,299	
	127	315,732	2,486	
1603-1616	4 (corrupt)	5,160	1,290	2,507
	123	310,572	2,525	
	7 (Jonson's)	23,793	3,399	
	116	286,779	2,472	
	13 (Shakespeare's)	36,443	2,803	
1594-1616	103	250,336	2,430	2,545
	185	465,666	2,518	
	6 (corrupt)	8,073	1,345	
	179	457,593	2,557	
	11 (Jonson's)	39,385	3,580	
1594-1616	168	418,208	2,490	2,560
	32 (Shakespeare's)	87,804	2,744	
	136	330,504	2,430	
	233	564,383	2,422	
	18 (corrupt)	25,824	1,433	
1590-1616	215	538,559	2,505	2,515
	11 (Jonson's)	39,385	3,580	
	204	499,174	2,447	
	37 (Shakespeare's)	101,803	2,751	
	167	397,371	2,379	

The results of Table III are approximate ; for greater accuracy more detail is necessary. Before computing averages it was necessary to remove from the list corrupt plays or abridgments of longer non-extant plays. Most of these are anonymous and came to the press after the disastrous plague years of 1592-1594 ; usually they are short, but we must keep in mind that carefully edited plays, such as *Sophonisba* (1,611 lines), *The Conspiracy of Byron* (2,058 lines), *Blurt Master Constable* (2,054 lines), *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (2,136 lines), *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (2,028 lines), *Humour Out of Breath* (1,897 lines), and many others not much longer were written at a time when the average length of plays was at its highest. We are not justified in asserting that a play is necessarily corrupt or abridged because it is hundreds of lines shorter than other plays written by the same author. Corruption, too, may increase rather than decrease the length of a play—the *Doctor Faustus* of 1616 adds over 700 lines, most of them poor stuff; to the corrupt abridgment printed in 1604. The sub-divided table opposite (IV) gives the calculated average length for each group of plays included in the same periods as in the preceding table. In each divisional table the estimated average given in Table III and the computed average are placed together for purpose of comparison.

After 1616 the average length of plays fell steadily till it was about 2,250 lines, and very few plays varied very much from the average. Thus Shirley during the last ten years before the closing of the theatres in 1642 wrote twenty-three plays that averaged about 2,230 lines ; not one of these exceeded 2,500 lines in length.

These tables must convince any reader that at no time during the thirty years 1587-1616 did the average length of plays much exceed 2,500 lines. Though much less than a half of the plays acted at the Rose, Theatre and Curtain prior to the plague of 1592-1594 have come down to us, we may accept without distrust 2,250 lines as the normal length of a play at that period. Shakespeare undoubtedly originated the practice of writing plays too long to be completely acted. When the theatres re-opened in June 1594, Greene, Marlowe, and perhaps Kyd, were dead, Peele and Lodge had probably ceased to write for the stage, and a new generation of dramatists began work ; among the dramatists writing between 1594 and 1603 were Heywood, Munday, Chettle, Chapman, Drayton, Jonson, Porter, Day, Dekker, Hathaway, Haughton, Webster, Marston and Middleton, though some of these, perhaps, may have been connected with the stage

before the plague. It was during the following decade that the average length of plays reached its highest, viz. 2,627 lines; yet a little investigation shows that there was no real rise. The contribution made by Jonson and Shakespeare to the total of fifty-six plays amounts to more than two-fifths; Jonson's four printed plays average 3,900 lines, and add nearly 100 lines to the average length of the whole. Another cause of the rise was the great vogue of the rambling and episodic play on English history of which thirteen belong to this period; these average 2,839 lines a-piece. If we exclude these and the four prodigious plays of Jonson, the average length of the remaining thirty-nine plays, which include fifteen of Shakespeare's, falls to 2,439 lines, a result in exact agreement with that for the succeeding period 1603-1616. If we use the term "Elizabethan play" in its strict sense and consider the plays of the period 1587-1603 we find that, after excluding the four plays of Jonson and twenty-one plays on subjects taken from English history from the total of ninety-two plays with sound texts, the average length of the remaining sixty-seven is 2,282 lines. This result agrees well with the average of 2,299 lines for all plays written by authors other than Jonson and Shakespeare during the last fourteen years of the Queen's reign.

For the period 1603-1616, the great age of our poetic drama, the average length of all plays with sound texts drops from 2,627 to 2,525 lines; if, however, we omit the plays of Jonson and Shakespeare the average length of plays for the whole period 1594-1616 remains the same—a fact that by itself is a striking and convincing proof that the conditions of play production and stage representation did not change much during the whole of Shakespeare's dramatic career. More than thirty dramatists contributed one or more plays to a total of 136 plays; this number is enough to give us a satisfactory basis for a reliable average. A large number of these dramas were carefully edited by their authors, and we may confidently rely upon a result to which so many contribute their mites. Jonson in this, as in his artistic attitude, stands apart from his contemporaries. His plays average over 800 lines a play more than those of Shakespeare and exceed the general average by 1,150 lines; he seems to have regarded length as a merit. Just as we must exclude abridgments and corrupt plays because they contain less than the authors wrote and thus reduce the average, so we must exclude the plays of one who deliberately wrote far more than could be acted, and then

LENGTH OF ELIZABETHAN & JACOBEOAN PLAYS 149

made considerable additions to over-long plays prior to printing them.

A summary of the results for the years 1594-1616 is worth making. Thirty-three known authors contributed 179 plays in all. Jonson wrote eleven of these, averaging 3,580 lines a play, Shakespeare thirty-two, averaging 2,744 lines. The remaining thirty-one dramatists provided 136 plays that average 2,430 lines. Which of these three ought we to accept as the normal length of plays written for the public stage? Shakespeare's? Jonson's? or that of the thirty-one dramatists? There can be but one answer—the thirty-one authors determine the rule, the two are the exception; accordingly we may say that the normal length of a play in the days of Shakespeare was about 2,430 lines.

In confirmation of this important result I add a list giving the average length of 144 plays with sound texts written by fifteen of the principal dramatists and acted on the public stage during the years 1590-1616; any corrupt or abridged play is omitted. By the side of the author's name is placed the name of the editor of the edition used.

TABLE V

GIVING THE AVERAGE LENGTH OF PLAYS BY CERTAIN DRAMATISTS

Name of author.	Name of editor.	Number of plays.	Average length in lines.
Peele	Bullen	2	2,325
Greene	Collins	4	2,197
Kyd	Boas	2	2,318
Marlowe	Bullen	5	2,302
Shakespeare	Clark and Wright	37	2,751
Chapman	Parrott	12	2,405
Middleton	Bullen	13	2,487
Jonson	Herford and Simpson }	11	3,580
	Various editors		
Marston	Bullen	9	2,211
Dekker	Pearson's reprint	11	2,777
Beaumont and } Fletcher }	Bullen } Waller }	17	2,580
Day	Bullen		
Heywood	Pearson's reprint	13	2,511
Webster	Lucas	3	2,688
		144	2,626

Dissecting these figures we have—

144 plays contain	378,109 lines ; average 2,626 lines.
11 " (Jonson's) contain	39,385 " " 3,580 "
133 " " " " " " " " " "	338,724 " " 2,547 "
37 " (Shakespeare's) contain	101,803 " " 2,751 "
96 " contain	236,921 " " 2,468 "

This average of 2,468 lines is significant, because it proves that thirteen very important dramatists thought a play somewhat below 2,500 lines quite long enough for any London theatre. Many, if not the majority, of these ninety-six plays were carefully edited by their authors, and we may be certain that we have all that they wrote, and probably more than was spoken by the actors in certain plays. This average agrees very well with that for the 136 plays written by authors other than Shakespeare and Jonson during the years 1594-1616. If we include Shakespeare's plays the average length for 133 plays does not exceed 2,550 lines, or 450 lines less than the modern "normal length" postulated by Professor J. D. Wilson and others.

Some critics may suggest that the Chamberlain-King's men may have staged longer plays than other companies ; it is therefore worth while finding the average length of the plays acted at each important London theatre during the period 1594-1603. I have accepted the repertory assigned to each company by Sir E. K. Chambers,¹ and have taken into account 175 plays, a number which includes some written and acted before the re-organisation of 1594. Not more than one-eighth of all the plays known to have been acted during this period are omitted ; most of these are rather short.

I. THE CHAMBERLAIN-KING'S MEN

72 plays contain	191,216 lines ; average 2,656 lines.
3 " (corrupt or short) contain	3,261 " " 1,087 "
69 " contain	187,955 " " 2,724 "
7 " (Jonson's) contain	24,053 " " 3,436 "
62 " " " " " " " " " "	163,902 " " 2,644 "
37 " (Shakespeare's) contain	101,803 " " 2,751 "
25 " " " " " " " " " "	62,099 " " 2,484 "

Though this total of seventy-two plays is more than double the number that survives of the repertory of the Admiral-Prince's men,

¹ *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. iv, Appendix L, pp. 379-97, and Appendix N, pp. 404-406.

probably twice as many have been lost. More than half of their extant plays are Shakespeare's. Burbage and his partners produced no less than twenty-one of surviving plays that contain over 3,000 lines each; eleven are by Shakespeare, and seven by Jonson. Their contribution of forty-four plays out of a total of seventy-two swamps and obscures the far lower figures of at least seven, and perhaps a dozen authors represented in the remaining twenty-five plays. For the years 1594-1603 the Admiral's men produced a play about every fortnight; even if we suppose that the audiences of the Curtain, Globe and Blackfriars were not quite so fond of novelty as those who patronised the Rose and the Fortune, we probably underestimate in suggesting that Shakespeare's fellows produced a new play every five or six weeks. On this scale of production they would have bought quite 200 plays during this period, and the extant seventy-two plays would represent about a third of their repertoire. Who wrote the missing plays? For an answer read the record of Chettle's work in Henslowe's diary; ¹ he had a hand in forty-eight plays, and his name does not appear on the title-page of one. The average of 2,494 lines for twenty-five plays written by dramatists other than Jonson and Shakespeare is in excellent agreement with the 2,468 lines obtained for ninety-six plays above in Table V; it indicates that plays provided by Shakespeare's "fellows" averaged about 2,500 lines. This average is supported by the fact that the additions made to *The Malcontent* "to entertaine a little more time, and to abridge the not received customs of musicke in our theater," make it 2,531 lines in length.

II. THE ADMIRAL-PRINCE'S MEN

If we may judge from Henslowe's records for the nine years, 1594-1603, the thirty-two plays attributed to this company represent not an eighth part of those acted by them during the twenty-two years, 1594-1616. How tight a grip Henslowe and the actors kept upon their plays may be realised from the fact that from 1606 to 1616 three only of their plays came to the press. The following are the figures:

32 plays contain	78,397 lines; average 2,450 lines.
4 " (corrupt) contain	5,804 " " 1,451 "
28 " contain	72,593 " " 2,592 "

¹ Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, vol. ii, pp. 264-67.

This average agrees well enough with that of 2,644 lines for the sixty-two plays of the King's, and is about 100 lines a play higher than that of plays written by authors other than Shakespeare and Jonson. Two of Dekker's plays and one of Porter's exceed 3,000 lines, but the totals for these and twelve other plays were computed from texts in which the full prose line contains ten words and are too high.

III. THE WORCESTER-ANNE'S MEN

This company seems to have made its first London appearance in 1601, and was taken under Queen Anne's patronage early in the new reign. Heywood was their principal playwright during this period, and accounts for more than half of the extant twenty-two plays; two or three of these are doubtful attributions.

22 plays contain	52,533 lines; average 2,388 lines.
2 " (corrupt) contain	2,934 " " 1,467 "
20 " contain	49,599 " " 2,480 "

This average is substantially the same as that of plays produced by the King's men, if we omit the work of Shakespeare and Jonson. Only one play exceeds 3,000 lines.

IV. THE CHILDREN OF ST. PAUL'S

Twenty printed plays belonging to the repertory of this boys' company for the years 1599-1606 are extant.

20 plays contain	45,970 lines; average 2,299 lines.
1 play (short) contains	1,217 " " "
19 plays contain	44,753 " " 2,355 "

This is the lowest average for any of the five theatres, and is due almost entirely to the unusually short plays written by Marston. Although no play equals 3,000 lines in length, or practically one-half, nine exceed 2,500 lines. The dramatists include Dekker, Marston, Middleton, Beaumont, Chapman, Webster, and probably others; we may certainly rely on the soundness of the texts.

V. THE CHILDREN OF THE CHAPEL AND OF THE QUEEN'S REVELS

This important company of boy actors seem to have been acting off and on from 1600 to 1614; almost every dramatist of importance

LENGTH OF ELIZABETHAN & JACOBEOAN PLAYS 153

except Dekker, Webster and Shakespeare contributed plays to their repertory, the list of authors, including Jonson, Day, Marston, Chapman, Middleton, Beaumont, Fletcher, Daniel and Field. Jonson jeeringly says, "The ghosts of some three or foure playes, departed a dozen years since, have bin seene walking on youre stage heere"; which suggests that new versions of old plays were upon the acting list.

29 plays contain	74,347 lines; average 2,564 lines.
3 " (Jonson's) contain	11,493 " " 3,831 "
26 " contain	62,854 " " 2,417 "

The average of 2,417 lines a play is a little higher than that of the plays produced by the Children of St. Paul's, and is substantially the same as the average for all plays other than those of Shakespeare and Jonson during the years 1594-1616. Three plays are over 3,000 lines—all Jonson's, and exactly one-half exceed 2,500 lines. The textual soundness of most of these plays cannot be successfully challenged.

On combining the figures for all the companies our results are as below:

Plays.	Total lines.	Average lines per play.
175	442,463	2,528
10 (corrupt or abridged)	13,216	1,322
165	429,247	2,601
11 (Jonson's)	39,385	3,580
154	389,862	2,532
37 (Shakespeare's)	101,803	2,751
117	288,059	2,462

We have now established certain facts that apply to all extant plays with sound texts written or acted during the years 1594-1616.

1. Plays of 3,000 lines and upwards were very rarely written, except by Jonson or Shakespeare, and amount in all to less than one-eighth of the total number.

2. Jonson's plays are abnormally long, averaging nearly 3,580 lines, and must be excluded from the count if we are to obtain a correct average.

3. This average for all plays (except Jonson's), written or acted during this period, is 2,490 lines.

4. The average length of all the plays written by fourteen important dramatists (excluding Jonson) during these years is 2,547 lines, or only fifty-seven lines higher than the general average for all authors.

5. The average length of all the plays (except Jonson's) produced by the five most important companies at the principal London theatres equals 2,532 lines.

6. The high average length of Shakespeare's plays is largely due to the presence of ten plays on English history ; if these are deducted the length of his remaining twenty-seven plays equals 2,671 lines.

We may arrive at the normal length of 2,500 lines in yet another way. Let us exclude from our list as supernormal eight plays over 3,400 lines and twenty plays under 1,600 lines as subnormal. There will remain 205 plays ranging between 3,400 and 1,600 lines ; of these 103 are above and 102 below 2,500 lines, the mean of the highest and the lowest. This is exactly the result that we should expect to get if we asked forty authors to write five plays a-piece, stipulating that they must not exceed 3,400 lines, or write less than 1,600 lines. On the other hand, if we gave our authors to understand that audiences were accustomed to plays of about 3,000 lines in length, they would certainly write almost as many plays above the standard as below it.

NEW LIGHT ON SIR WILLIAM CORNWALLIS, THE ESSAYIST

By P. B. WHITT

SIR WILLIAM CORNWALLIS the younger, the essayist, was a literary figure of some repute in his own day. He was a friend of John Donne and Sir Thomas Overbury; he was regarded favourably by the third Earl of Southampton; and in the opinion of Francis Osborne, was "none of the meanest Wits in his Time."¹ He was not, however, the Sir William Cornwallis who was a friend of Ben Jonson.² It was the essayist's uncle, Sir William Cornwallis the elder, who resided for many years at Highgate, for whom Jonson wrote *Penates; or a Private Entertainment for the King and Queen*, on the occasion of their visit to Highgate on May-day, 1604.³

It is partly owing to this confusion between uncle and nephew, and partly to the unreliability of its basic material that the account of the essayist's life in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is at fault.⁴ Few of the lesser-known writers can have been so long misrepresented as Sir William Cornwallis the younger has been. He has long been considered as an amiable, comfortably-placed country gentleman, M.P. for his county, a prolific essayist for thirty years, and one whose career resembled that of his literary model, Montaigne.⁵ There is scarcely a vestige of truth in this.

It will be necessary, in order to consider the life of the essayist in its correct relationship to his family and his times, to say something of Charles Cornwallis, the essayist's father, and William, the essayist's uncle. The father of these two gentlemen was Sir Thomas

¹ Proem, *A Miscellany of Essays, Paradoxes* . . . , 8th ed. 1682.

² D.N.B., "Cornwallis, Sir William."

³ Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, i, pp. 430-31. Mr. C. E. Avery, in a letter to T.L.S. November 6, 1930, adduces evidence of Sir William Cornwallis the elder's connections with Highgate. See also Hatfield MSS. Calendar Pt. V, 1594-5 (Hist. MSS. Comm.).

⁴ See my letter in T.L.S. October 23, 1930, to which confirmatory evidence was added by Mr. C. E. Avery (*loc. cit.*) and Mr. R. E. Bennett (T.L.S. November 20 and December 4).

⁵ Lee, *The French Renaissance in England* (1910), pp. 174-75. Error repeated in E. N. S. Thompson, *The Seventeenth Century Essay* (Univ. Iowa, 1926), p. 37.

Cornwallis, a Roman Catholic and Comptroller of the Household of Queen Mary. His seat was Brome Hall, Suffolk, where his sons were born. There was constant dissension between the brothers, an unhappy state of affairs to which Sir Thomas alludes in 1594 in a letter to his daughter, Lady Kytson. William the elder had apparently accused Charles of having caused the death, in 1565, of William's child, the heir to the family property. As the elder William had no further heir until 1611, the young William, the essayist, stood in the direct line of succession, a fact which explains the constant feud between the elder William and his brother Charles. Sir Thomas says :¹

Upon examination of y^e cause, you shall find I thinke, faulte in both. Wylyam, too suspicious and cholerick in expostulating his grief conceived ; Charles, too proud and arrogant in hys answers and defence. I have been playne, and blamed them bothe, especially Charles, whose parte it was to have a reverend regarde to hys elder brother, how innocent soever he was in the matter charged upon him. . . . Your brother Wylyam is prodigal, and therefore needy. Charles, on the other side, ys covetous, and too attent to gayne. (At Brome, October 23, 1594.)

The younger brother's ambitions were continually being frustrated by the machinations of the elder, who appears throughout in a very unfavourable light. The elder William, who was knighted perhaps in 1594, had a bad reputation at Court.² In 1597 he wrote an amazing letter to Secretary Cecil with reference to preferment at Court,³ and in 1600 was suspected by Essex of underhand dealings.⁴ I shall have occasion to return later to his plotting against his brother Charles. Sir William the elder died on November 13, 1611. After his death litigation took place between his widow and Sir Charles.⁵

Little of importance is known concerning Sir Charles Cornwallis before his being appointed resident ambassador to Spain in 1605, which office he held until 1609.⁶ He was knighted at the Charter House on July 11, 1603. Prior to that he seems to have been con-

¹ The quotation is from John Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Hengrave in Suffolk*, 1822. I have not seen the original letter.

² In 1595, Rowland & Whyte reported that Cornwallis was troubling the Queen's ear with tales of the Earl of Essex (quoted in Birch, *Mem. of Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, i, p. 313).

³ *Cal. State Papers Dom. Eliz.*, Vol. 1595-97, p. 429.

⁴ *Cal. Hatfield MSS. Pt. XIV (Addenda)*, p. 129.

⁵ *Letters of Lady Jane Cornwallis*, p. 97. Sir William's widow, who was the daughter of Hercules Meautys, afterwards married Sir Nathaniel Bacon.

⁶ The *D.N.B.* account of Sir Charles is correct enough. Other details are given in the Cornwallis pedigree appended to *Lady Jane Cornwallis's Letters*.

cerned in land transactions in Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex,¹ possibly with a view to establishing his independence of his elder brother. His first wife was Anne, daughter of Thomas Fincham, of Fincham, in Norfolk, and widow of Richard Nicholls, who died in 1574. She died in 1584 and was buried at Fincham on July 29. Charles's second wife was Anne, daughter of Thomas Barrow and widow of Ralph Shelton. This lady was buried in Barking on March 30, 1617, and Sir Charles three years later married Dorothy, daughter of John Vaughan, Bishop of London and widow of John Jeggon, Bishop of Norwich. After Sir Charles Cornwallis was recalled from Spain he was from 1610 to 1612 Treasurer of the Household of Henry, Prince of Wales, whom he attended through his fatal illness, an account of which he wrote. He was sent as one of four Commissioners to Ireland in 1613 to investigate Irish grievances, and in June 1614 was committed to the Tower on suspicion of fanning Parliamentary opposition to the King.² He remained in imprisonment for a year. His subsequent life was uneventful and is of no importance for our purpose in this account of the essayist. Sir Charles died in 1629 and was buried at St. Giles's-in-the-Fields.

William Cornwallis, the essayist, eldest son³ of Charles Cornwallis by his first wife, was born probably about 1579⁴ in Norfolk. Little is directly discoverable about his early life and education. It is probable that he was at Oxford, though his name is not in any of the usual books of reference. The clue to his residence at Oxford is a slender one. Sir Nicholas Overbury dictating some notes to his grandson, Nicholas Oldisworth, in 1637 said :

When Sir Tho: Overbury was a little past 20 yeares old, hee and John Guilby, his father's chiefe clerke, were sent vpon a voyage of pleasure to Edinburgh, with 60^{li} between them. There Thom. mett with Sir William Cornwallis, one who knew him in Queene's Colledge at Oxford. Sir W^m commended him to diverse, & among the rest to Robin Carr, then page to the earle of Dunbarre : so they came along to England together, & were great friends.⁵

¹ Blomefield, *History of Norfolk* ; W. A. Copinger, *Manors of Suffolk* ; T. Wright, *History of Essex*.

² He addressed a letter to the King from the Tower on June 22, 1614 (Harleian MS. 1221, copied in Harleian MS. 7002).

³ Sir Charles in his *Letter of Direction and advice to his Son* (Francis), printed in *Sir Thomas Phillipps Tracts, Miscellanea I*, refers to the fact that "two broods have preceded" this "child of his old age."

⁴ This date is to be inferred from the unpublished paradoxes in the Tanner MS. (clxix, 132) which were "written by S^r William Cornewaleys the younger knight in the yeere of our Lord Christ 1600 beinge the 22th yeere of his age."

⁵ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 15476.

According to Edmund Gosse,¹ Donne and Cornwallis were friends at Oxford, but this is pure surmise. Donne was at Oxford 1584-1587, far too early for Cornwallis to have been contemporary with him. Sir Thomas Overbury was at Queen's College, Oxford, 1595-1598, a date which is suspiciously late for the essayist.

In any case, from the essayist's writings it is evident that he received a good general education, which enabled him to find from many sources adequate material for purposes of illustration. He never claims to be a scholar,² and in common with Montaigne and other essayists, he sets his face resolutely against pedantry and mere bookishness. It is clear that he read with discrimination,³ and could turn to profit what he read. He had no close acquaintance with Homer, he says, but knew Virgil. He mentions Plutarch, Tacitus and Seneca with admiration, but esteems Cicero neither for matter nor style. In his early life he was "bound" to *Arthur of Brittain* and *Huon of Bordeaux*.⁴ Of the more modern European writers he refers to Tasso, Guicciardini, Commynes and Montaigne. The last he apparently read in a MS. translation,⁵ but it seems unlikely that this was his sole means of acquaintance with Montaigne, the originality of whose method Cornwallis was the first among Englishmen to perceive, though dimly. He pays a generous tribute to his parents, who were "more carefull of my mynd, then of my bodie, whose aduise or example, if I will follow, I cannot stray."⁶

On August 26, 1595, William married Katherine, daughter of Sir Philip Parker, of Erwarton, Suffolk, on which occasion Charles Cornwallis, his father, granted him £200 a year.⁷ This settlement took the form of the Manor of Grimston Hall, with Marston Manor in the parish of Trimley St. Martin (Suffolk), together with the Manors of Haspley and Newbourne, and the advowson of the

¹ *Life and Letters of John Donne*, vol. i, p. 90, but on p. 216 he asserts that "Sir William Cornwallis of Brome" was Donne's "Old Oxford friend." This is not only contradictory but wrong, as Mr. R. E. Bennett points out in *T.L.S.* (November 20, 1930). Sir William Cornwallis the elder was at Cambridge years earlier.

² "I sucked not long enough of my Schoolemaster to prove a Commentor" ("The Prayse of the Emperour Julian the Apostata" in *Essays, or rather Encomions*, 1616).

³ Ess. 45, "Of Essayes and Bookes," *passim*, 1610 ed.

⁴ Ess. 15, "Of the obseruation and vse of things," Sg. H7^r, H8^r.

⁵ Ess. 12, "Of Censuring," Sg. G4^r.

⁶ Ess. 12, "Of Censuring."

⁷ Harleian MS. 1875, f. 91^r. "To the Earl of Salisbury, principall secretarie to his Ma^{ty}." Written in 1605 from Sir Charles Cornwallis in Spain.

church at Newbourn.¹ Less than two years later, the property had to be sold to defray William's debts.² Henceforth there are continual references to the son's reckless extravagance and the constant drain on his father's resources. William's early marriage, the size of his family,³ his unattainable ambitions, and his love of expensive living, all combined to keep him in a state of chronic poverty for the rest of his life.

He joined Essex's expedition to Ireland (March 27–September 28, 1599), and was one of many who received the honour of knighthood during that campaign. The honour was conferred upon him on August 5, 1599.⁴ For no apparent reason it has been supposed that the William Cornwallis knighted in Ireland was the uncle of the essayist,⁵ but the elder William is so consistently styled "Sir William" from 1594 onwards that the references can hardly be accidental.⁶ Moreover, it is scarcely likely that the elder William would serve under Essex, to whom he was always hostile. In any case, from the elder knight's correspondence with Sir Robert Cecil, we learn that during the period of Essex's stay in Ireland, Sir William the elder was in London recuperating after a serious illness.⁷ The essayist makes a casual mention of his military service in one of his essays: "yet did I once touch at the baye of Armes, but so short was my stay, that I trust more to my reading then to my Experience."⁸

Further opportunity of serving his country in any capacity being denied, the essayist betook himself to a quieter fashion of living, and it is during this brief period that most of his literary work was done. He appears to have alternated between extravagance and frugality, between foolishness and contrition. Sir Charles, writing some five years later to the Earl of Salisbury, says:

¹ Add. Ch. 10236, quoted in Copinger, *op. cit.* iii, 99. Part of this property had been acquired by Charles Cornwallis from Thomas Cavendish in 1591.

² Harleian MS. 1875, f. 91^r; Copinger, *op. cit.* iii, 99.

³ According to the Cornwallis pedigree in *Letters of Lady Jane Cornwallis*, the essayist had eleven children in all, some of whom were associated with Mileham and Burnham Thorpe, Norfolk, in later years. At his death, the widow was left with eight children (Chamberlain to Carleton, July 7, 1614. State Papers Dom., James I (S.P. 14), vol. 77, item 58.)

⁴ Shaw, *Book of Knights*.

⁵ D.N.B. Collins; *Peerage* (Brydges) ii, 548; Copinger, *op. cit.* iii, 237.

⁶ Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, i, 313; *Cal. S.P.D. Eliz.*, 1595–1597, pp. 324, 429; *Cal. Hatfield MSS.* V 1594–1595; *Journals of all the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Eliz.* (1682 ed.), p. 561. Mr. R. E. Bennett cites other evidence in *T.L.S.*, December 1930.

⁷ *Cal. Hatfield MSS.* IX, pp. 162 and 167.

⁸ Ess. 19, "Of Life and the fashions of Life," Sg. K4^r.

Hee then wthdrewe himselfe, & beganne to bee as farre in loue wth a frugall Course of life as before hee had giuen signes to haue little Care of spending.¹

His essays² and verses,³ written in or before 1601, have a prevailing melancholy and a strong note of self-reproach :

Myne owne life . . . endured continuall troubles, while youth and folly gouerned my barke in the sea of changes. . . . In the end I found my self ; I and my soule vndertooke to guide me into a more wholesome aire : I dare not say she hath kept promise really, but it was my owne fault, yet in part she hath. Her motions, my own memory and booke haue done something : these last I am much bound too, especially to Seneca⁴ and Plato . . . they ofttime make me thinke well.⁵

He is resolved to turn over a new leaf :

I haue knowne the extremitie of this Idle life, and of the other I haue had some litle taste and euen that taste I so much preferre, as I reckon not my life from the time of my birth, but from this day.⁶

He is disgusted with his former vanity :

I haue tasted of more then I haue digested ; for at twentie yeares old I vomited a great deale that I drunke at 19.⁷

All his literary work of this period, however, is not of this nature. In 1600 he wrote four paradoxes, which are preserved among the Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian Library.⁸ It is interesting to recall that Donne's *Paradoxes* have been dated before 1600, though from references to the *Problems* in Donne's letters, some of the compositions in this facetious vein may be dated as late as 1607.⁹ Cornwallis and Donne were friendly at this period, for the essayist sends his verses along to his "ever to be respeckted freand, Mr. John Done, Secretary to my Lorde Keeper," together with an epistle in verse.¹⁰

¹ Harleian MS., 1875, f. 91^r.

² *Essays* (Part I, 1600 ; Part II, 1601) by Sir William Corne-Waleys the younger, Knight. Printed for Edmund Mattes.

³ "The Contrition of a Convertite," "A Heavenly Hymne," and two separate stanzas on Care. Tanner MS. CCCVI, ff. 233-36.

⁴ *Discourses upon Seneca the Tragedian*, 1601.

⁵ Ess. 1, "Of Resolution," Sg. A4^r, A5^r.

⁶ Ess. 12, "Of Censuring," Sg. F8^r.

⁷ Ess. 43, "Of Vanitie," Sg. Ee1^r.

⁸ Tanner MS. CLXIX, f. 132. "That a great redd nose is an ornament to the Face (cf. Donne, Problem 11, p. 58, in edition of Geoffrey Keynes, 1923) ; That it is a happiness to be in debt ; That miserie is true Felicity ; That Inconstancy is more commendable than Constancie." Mr. R. E. Bennett has printed these in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Vol. XIII, 1931.

⁹ Gosse, *Life and Letters of John Donne* ; E. M. Simpson, *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne*.

¹⁰ Tanner MS. CCCVI, ff. 233-37. Printed in Grierson, *The Poems of John Donne*, ii, 171-72.

Donne became Secretary to Sir Thomas Egerton, the Lord Keeper, in 1598, and remained with him four years. There are two lines of special interest in this verse epistle :

If then for change, of howers you seem careles
Agree wth me to lose them at the playes.

The Paradoxes printed in 1616 and 1617 were written several years after the four in the Tanner MSS.¹ One of these, *The encomium of Richard the 3rd*, is dedicated to his "worthy friend Mr. John Donne."² The later compositions are, like the earlier ones, much longer and more elaborate than Donne's, though Cornwallis lacked Donne's wit and cynicism.

Whatever his other failings may have been, Cornwallis was certainly modest concerning his literary work. The dedication of Part I of the *Essayes* by Henry Olney says "The author hateth nothing more than comming in publick." Cornwallis himself, writing to Sir John Hobart,³ who had commended the Paradoxes, remarks that in keeping them secret, he had shown some little discretion. He continues : "I knowe their weaknes to be vnmeet obieackts for your Syght and for his whear you sawe them."⁴ To Sir John's request for more he promises two weekly if Sir John's letters "betray him to desier any more." Cornwallis protests against his correspondent's attributing virtue to him, refers to his "shipwrecked barke," and to the impotence of Philosophy, "who can anatomise the transitoriness of outward disaffairs, but heals not inward grief." Sir John Hobart was a kinsman, adviser and friend of the family, to whom letters were addressed by Sir Thomas Cornwallis, Sir Charles, Sir William the elder, and the essayist. On two occasions,⁵ the last-named writes pleading poverty, but as neither letter is dated, I am unable to place them in their correct sequence. One excuses the essayist's slackness in payment and pleads necessity as "an irremediable lett," but promises amendment : "Shortly I will make good and for ever approue myself." The tone of the other letter is

¹ Mr. R. E. Bennett, in *Harvard University Studies*, Vol. XIII, 1931, has established this date from internal evidence.

² In MS. at Hardwick Hall (*Hist. MSS. Comm. 3rd Report*, App. pp. 41, 43). A MS. copy of the "Praise of King Richard the Third" exists, dedicated to Sir Henry Nevill and signed "Hen. W." (B.M. Add. 29307).

³ Tanner MS. CCLXXXIII, f. 204. Letters to Hobart from Sir Thomas, Sir Charles and Sir William the elder are among the Tanner MSS.

⁴ This may refer to Sir Stephen Powle, in whose commonplace book the Paradoxes are preserved.

⁵ Tanner MSS. CCLXXXV, f. 8 and CCLXXXVI, f. 138.

urgent: "Yet behold the power of wife and children when their wants (ever the chiefest) come in question. . . . Our extremity is greater then I can write, and if we have not some supply I protest before God we fall into the miserablest extremity." "Though I come honestly by my povertie, I am yet ashamed of it." Another letter, written to his kinswoman Lady Withipoll,¹ enjoins her to exercise mercy, but there is no clue to the circumstances which prompted the letter.

From 1601 to 1605, with financial assistance from his father, the essayist was apparently engaged in public and Court life. In 1601 or 1602, he was in Edinburgh, where, as we have seen already, he met Sir Thomas Overbury, whom he commended to Robin Carr, then page to the Earl of Dunbar. His father, in a letter to the Earl of Salisbury in 1605,² complains that the money with which he had supplied his son to enable him to keep up state befitting his standing and to insinuate himself into the good opinion of his equals, was extravagantly employed. So heavy were the expenses of the journey to Scotland and the subsequent attendance on the King, that the son had been forced to sell all his lands. In a later letter to Sir Henry Wotton,³ Sir Charles bitterly complains that the son had spent more than £5000 at Court.

In 1604 and 1614, William Cornwallis the younger was M.P. for Orford in Suffolk,⁴ and during the Parliament of 1604 he spoke on the question of the Union of England and Scotland. In the same year appeared his tract: *The Miraculous and Happie Union of England and Scotland*.⁵ Both speech and tract excited unfavourable comment. In a letter to Donne in May 1604, a correspondent says:⁶

Sir William Cornwally hath taken upon him to answer the Objections against the Union, but they are done so lamely; and, although it seem

¹ Tanner MS. CCLXXXVI, f. 134. To this lady he addressed Ess. 39, "Of Conceit." He regarded her, however, with great respect. He desires Hobart to remember him to "honest Sir Edmund and his worthy, witty, excellent lady." (Tanner MS. CCLXXXIII, f. 204.)

² Harleian MS. 1875, f. 91.

³ Harleian MS. 1875, f. 564.

⁴ D.N.B. is in error in saying he was M.P. for Lostwithiel in 1597. As Mr. R. E. Bennett points out (*T.L.S.*, November 20, 1930), it was the elder William who was M.P. for Lostwithiel.

⁵ "London. Imprinted for Edward Blount, 1604." Anonymous, but a MS. note on the title-page of the B.M. copy ascribes it to Sir William Cornwallis the younger. Another edition was printed for T. Finlason in Edinburgh in the same year.

⁶ *A Collection of Letters made by Sir Tobie Matthews*, 1660, p. 293. Goosse, *op. cit.* i, 127, omits the reference to the book. He conjectures the correspondent to be Christopher Brooke.

scarce possible, so much worse than his Book, as (if he were not a kind friend of yours) I would expresse that wonder which I have in my heart, how he keeps himself from the Coat with long sleeves. It is incredible to think, if it were not true, that such simplicity of conceit could not be joynd in him, with so impudent utterance.

In May 1603, according to the information given in a letter written by Philip Gawdy to his brother,¹ Sir William Cornwallis, probably the essayist, with a number of other English and Scotch, were "sworne of the pryvy chamber."

In 1605, Sir Charles Cornwallis, the essayist's father, proceeded to Spain as resident ambassador, and later in the same year the essayist was in Spain with his father, who entrusted him with the delivery of certain communications, usually of a private nature, to the Secretaries of State in London. On June 1, 1605, Sir Charles writes from Valladolid to the effect that he has sent the Bill of Charges of Transportation and Rewards in Court, "ordinarily imposed here upon all Ambassadors," to Lord Viscount Cranborne by the hand of his son, William Cornwallis.² Several journeys of this nature, apparently, were made, and the son earned the favourable regard of some in high authority, the Earls of Salisbury, Southampton, and Northampton, and Sir Henry Wotton. The last named, in a letter written to Sir Charles on October 2, 1605, suggests a regular correspondence :

And I shall besides herein take a great deale of Comfort, to hold in continuall remembrance, the honest loue, w^{ch} hath long beene betweene yo^r: worthy sonne & mee."³

And shortly afterwards Sir Charles, in a letter to Wotton, says :

My owne sonne Willi : Cornwallyes was late here wth mee, & had speech of you, saying hee had written many lres to yo^r: lo^{pp} since yo^r: deptime out of England but was neuer soe much fauoured as to receiue anie one in Exchange.⁴

It is probable that Sir Charles and his son quarrelled shortly afterwards, and that public opinion did not altogether favour the father. Both Salisbury and Northampton praise the son in letters to the father and advise the grant of further means to facilitate the son's

¹ *Letters of Philip Gawdy, of West Harling, Norfolk, and of London, to Various Members of his Family, 1579-1616*, ed. I. H. Jeayes (Rox. Club, 1906), p. 130.

² Letter printed in Winwood's *Memorials of Affairs of State*, Vol. ii.

³ Harleian MS. 1875, f. 169^r.

⁴ *Ibid.* f. 171^r.

progress at Court. Northampton deems the time not ripe for seeking royal favour :

Yo^r: sonne liues Chargeable in this place, the spring of satisfaction is shut vp for a while because the wilde beasts of the forrests haue drunke too much and the K: resolves to take a breath it is Certayne that hee caries himselfe soe dutifully & honestly both to Prince and subiects as many wish him well, & will bee ready when the tyme is rype to recommend him wth their best affection. In the meanetyme if it please you to enable him, by some helpe of yo^r: bountie, to attend the wished houre, I doubt not but the Cropp will fully aunswer y^e care that hath bin taken.¹

Sir Charles expresses his pleasure at the commendation bestowed on his son :

It hath beene noe small comfort vnto mee, to receiue vnder the Testimony of soe noble & iudicious a hand so good an approbacōn of this bearer & to the end it may aswell appeare to yo^r: lo:^{pes} eyes as to myne owne thoughts, of what force anie request of yo^r: lo:^{pes} is vnto mee, I haue for his better enabling out of my p^{re}sent necessities, giuen vnto him 200:^{li} by the yeare more.²

Sir Charles says his tribulations in Spain would be considerably lightened if he could feel secure concerning his son's affairs at home :

Myne owne desire is that by yo^r: lo:^{pes} good meanes his Ma:^{tie} will bee pleased to make my poore son no stepchild to his Grace & bounty whereof soe manie others who haue lesse spent & as little deserued, haue tasted in such abunddance. A matter of noe great value would cleare vnto him myne estate, & a great Comfort it would bee vnto mee, who haue bestowed soe much trauaile to raise the House of a poore younger brother to leaue it to descend in peace to him & his who shall enioye it.³

It is evident that during Sir Charles's absence in Spain certain ill-disposed people, Sir William the elder and Sir Thomas Southwell, were trying to discredit him at Court. It was fortunate that the absent ambassador had such staunch advocates as the Earls of Salisbury and Northampton. Sir Charles's chief grievance is that his brother, taking advantage of his absence,

"hath gotten the fee simple of Two Mannors geuen to my Auncestors for seruice."⁴

¹ Harleian MS. 1875, f. 165^r.

² *Ibid.* f. 90^r.

³ *Ibid.* f. 124^r, addressed to the Earl of Salisbury. Similar thoughts are expressed in f. 92^r, where Sir Charles alludes to his grief in seeing "the Inheritance I intended to my poore house to bee in my life tyme aliened from it."

⁴ *Ibid.* f. 362^r.

A widow had complained to the Earl of Salisbury about Sir Charles, who points out that the woman is related to a man of Sir William the elder. The Earl of Northampton, however, informs Sir Charles that with the aid of the Earl of Salisbury, the machinations of the "unkind brother" and the false and scandalous representations of Southwell had been of no avail.¹ Sir Charles is counselled to settle some way with his son before the son's return "to satisfie the coulour of Expectation" in order to silence malicious reports. The King, says Northampton, has remained unaffected by the wiles of the elder William, whose character is shown in a very unfavourable light:

Many wrinche haue bin vsed to wind him into y^e Co:^{rt}, but a barque as rotten as the body that sailes in it cannot brooke an opposicōn of those braue mindes that striue wth him. Hee looketh daily for the death of the poore woman, that hee may both raise his owne fortune & as hee thinkes supplant yo^r hopes.²

The "poore woman" referred to was his first wife, who died shortly afterwards, the elder William's second choice being Jane Meautys who survived him. Chamberlain's comment to Carleton on October 5, 1611 throws a little light on the elder William's anxiety for an heir to his property: "But Sir William Cornwallis hath a heir that holds out," and in November 1611: "Sir William Cornwallis died the last week and hath left a fresh widow who by means of good friends hath gotten the wardship of her son, and so hath the whole estate in her hands."

The anxiety of Sir Charles for the security of his own property is therefore quite pardonable, and it is to his son that he looks for adequate representation of the family interests in London in his absence on State duties abroad. Sir Charles is relieved to hear from his noble correspondents such favourable reports of his son as to cause him to wonder whether he has not misjudged him. At least, the younger William has never had any great inclination to dice. He has been dear and loving to his father, faithful to his sworn friends, and even willing to learn from experience and advice.³ Sir Charles confidently hopes that the son will live to make good, and the fact that he is loved by noblemen of such high station is a happy augury.⁴ There is one occasion recorded on which the son

¹ Harleian MS., 1875, f. 165^r.

² Letter from Northampton to Sir Charles, Harleian MS. 1875, f. 166^r.

³ Harleian 1875, f. 91^v.

⁴ *Ibid.* f. 114.

actually intervened to try to safeguard his father's interests. In 1605 he writes to Sir Thomas Lake to request him not to pass any grant from the King to Sir Thomas Southwell's suit until the Earls of Salisbury and Northampton have been acquainted.¹ It was Sir Thomas Southwell who was in league with the elder William. But some unforeseen change in the son's fortunes must have taken place shortly afterwards, the exact nature of which has not yet been discovered. Sir Henry Wotton, writing to Sir Charles, says :

I haue had noe tre from yo^r Lopp^s sonne since I buryed him in the tediousnes of one of myne some 8 monthes since, wherein I tooke the libertie, which became rather my Loue than my wisdom to aduise him to staie about 67 (Wotton's cipher for King James). They are the places where goodwill should bee.²

It seems probable, therefore, that the essayist turned his back upon fortune by leaving Court. Sir Charles's fairest hopes are dashed, and the money so lavishly laid out has been wasted. Writing to Sir Henry Wotton, he says :

My good Lo: I thanke yow much for soe good a testimony of your loue to myne vnthrifty and vnfortunate sonne. Hee hath spent mee in y^e Courte above 5000^l. And now haueinge geuen him 200^l a yeaere more wherewith to liue, he turnes his backe to his fortunes. Of all sorts of people I most dispaire of those of his sorte, that are Philosophers in their wordes and fooles in their workes. To God Almightye his mercifull and gracious prouidence I must leaue him.³

In the meantime the printed words of Sir Charles's foolish philosopher son were finding a wider circle of readers. The *Essayes* appeared in a new edition in 1606, the second part being a reissue of the 1601 edition, and in 1610 an enlarged form of the work was issued, together with the *Discourses upon Seneca the Tragedian* ; Part I of the *Essayes* being a reissue of the 1606 edition. Three new essays : " Of Adversity," " Of Fortune and her children," and " Of the Admirable Abilities of the Mind " were added. Two of the titles are suggestive in view of Cornwallis's own experience. There is surely a personal echo in : " It is true that when we become of the world we are thrown into a troublesome Inne ; where respect goeth vpon the leggs of riches " ;⁴ or in " The medicine of experience

¹ S.P. 14, 17, 76. I have verified that the essayist wrote this letter by comparison of handwriting.

² Harleian MS. 1875, f. 561^r and 562^r.

³ *Ibid.* f. 564^r.

⁴ Ess. 50, " Of Aduersitie," Sg. Nn 5^r.

is not a simple, but a compositiō of many sortes." ¹ He professes to find all experience valuable: "I like not those spirits that dare not approach any thing but wisdom; when things are indifferent, I giue occasion the bridle and if she cary me into an Alehouse, it shal goe hard, but I wil get something there, if nothing edible, at least medicinable." ²

There is little to be discovered concerning the remainder of this irresponsible young man's life. Whether Sir Charles actually left him to his own resources is not certain, but some colour is given to this belief by the abject poverty in which the essayist left his wife and children at his death. His last days were darkened by severe illness, for as early as December 9, 1613, Chamberlain, writing to Carleton, reports the death of young Sir William Cornwallis. ³ It is curious that on the previous day the Earl of Suffolk, writing to Sir Thomas Lake, wishes the Lords Marshall would end the quarrel between young Cornwallis and Patrick Ramsay. ⁴ I am of the opinion that this does not refer to the essayist, but there is no clue in the letter to the identity of the Cornwallis mentioned. The epithet "young" might be applicable to the essayist, who was but thirty-four years old at this time. Further information concerning the essayist's final illness is found in a letter from the Rev. Thos. Lorkin to Sir Thomas Puckering, Bt., at Tours:

"The impression of this sad newes (Sir Charles Cornwallis's imprisonment) concurring with some other occasions, hath cast Sir William, his son, into so dangerous a sickness, as it is thought he will hardly escape with life." ⁵

This letter was written on July 2, 1614, but the essayist was buried in "St. Martin-in-the-Fields" on the previous day. ⁶ Chamberlain, in a letter to Carleton on July 7, 1614, reports the essayist's death, this time correctly:

Young Sr William Cornwallis died soone after his fathers committment, who kept so hard a hand upon him, that he hath left a miserable widow and eight poure children. ⁷

¹ Ess. 52, "Of the admirable Abilities of the Mind," Sg. Oo 7^r.

² *Ibid.* Sg. Oo. 6^r.

³ S.P. 14, 75, 44.

⁴ *Ibid.* 37.

⁵ Quoted in *The Court and Times of James the First*, Vol. i, p 33f. The original is Harleian MS. 7002, f. 338.

⁶ "July 1, 1614. Guliel Cornwallis, miles" (*Harleian Society Registers*, Vol. XXV, 1898).

⁷ S.P. 14, 77, 58.

The criticism of Sir Charles is certainly not applicable to a large part of the essayist's life, but may have reference to the concluding period. It must be remembered, however, that Sir Charles himself was in troubled waters at this time. I have referred elsewhere to the litigation which followed his brother William's death, added to which were his political misfortunes which culminated in his imprisonment in the Tower. While there is no mention of his son in a letter written by Sir Charles to his wife during the early part of his imprisonment,¹ he was not indifferent to the plight of his daughter-in-law and her children. A warrant was issued by the Lords of the Privy Council on July 1, 1614,² i.e. the day of the essayist's burial, authorising the Lieutenant of the Tower

to permitt Sir Calthropp Parker, Sir Francis Goodwyn, Sir Henry Glenham, Sir Edmund Withipole, Sir John Deane and Mr. Emanuel Giffard, or any of them, to have accesse to Sir Charles Cornwalllys at convenient tymes, and to speake with him, in the hearing and presence of the said Lievtenant, touching the assurance of a joynture to the Lady Cornwalllys, the wydowe of his sonne, Sir William Cornwalllys, knight, lately deceased; and [this] is donne upon the humble suite and petition of the said Lady Cornwalllys, and [in] consideration of her distressed case, being left altogether without maintenance for herself and her children.

In 1617, two years after his release, Sir Charles writes to Sir Julius Caesar to secure for his daughter an allowance of £104, in addition to a similar amount allowed by Sir Charles.³ The widow survived until January 30, 1636, and was buried at Erwarton, Suffolk.⁴

In the year before his death the essayist contributed an elegy: "On the untimely Death of the incomparable Prince, Henry" to the third edition of Sylvester's *Lachrymæ Lachrymarum*, to which Donne was also a contributor. The essayist's "dull Muse" rambles on for nearly two hundred lines; but four of them seem to bear on the writer's own life:

But I have not so manie Griefs to spare
(Nor shall this dropsie World suck up my Care)
That, but to Him and His untimely Fate,
Could lend one Sorrow from my haples State.

In 1616 appeared the first of his posthumous works: *Essayes or rather Encomions, Prayses of Sadnesse: and of the Emperour Julian*

¹ Harleian MS. 1221. Copied in MS. 7002.

² *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1613-1614. London, 1921, p. 484.

³ Lansdown MS. 165, f. 297.

⁴ Cornwalllis genealogy appended to *Private Correspondence of Lady Jane Cornwalllis*.

the *Apostata*, and in the same year, anonymously : *Essayes of Certaine Paradoxes* ; the second impression, enlarged by the inclusion of the "Encomions," was published in 1617. The final edition of the original 52 essays appeared in 1632, and has the same dedication as the 1610 edition.¹

Sufficient has perhaps been said to show what egregious errors have been made in estimating Cornwallis as a man and as a writer. No one can justly claim that he is among the great essayists, but it is by his essay work, certainly not by his ephemeral verses and his facetious trifles, that he deserves recognition. Historically, he is the first of the familiar essayists in our literature, and amidst the confusion of the religious and political writing of his day, it is a welcome relief to linger with one who strove, however imperfectly, to express his better self in the medium which he perceived to be specially suited to that purpose.

¹ Professor Hugh Walker in *The English Essay and Essayists*, p. 39, in a brief notice of Cornwallis remarks that allusions to *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and other plays of Shakespeare are scattered through the essays in the later editions. In the B.M. copy of the 1610 edition certain similarities between Cornwallis's expression and Shakespeare's are noted in MS., but these similarities are present in the 1601 edition as well.

A NOTE ON *COMUS*

By C. S. LEWIS

THE history of *Comus* may be briefly recapitulated as follows. It was written out by Milton—possibly without a previous rough copy—in the book known to us as the *Trinity MS.*, some time before Michaelmas night 1634. This version may be conveniently called *Trinity a*. From *Trinity a* a copy was made, probably by Henry Lawes, still before Michaelmas night 1634. The copying was not very accurately carried out, as the new MS. contains fifteen blunders. Some of these show misunderstanding of the text; thus, in 12 (Yet som there be that by due steps aspire), where Lawes reads *with due steps*, it seems probable that he took *steps* to mean “paces” or “strides,” where Milton was thinking of degrees in a stair or rungs in a ladder (cf. P.L. VIII. 591). Other errors affect the metre, as, for example, the unfortunate *enthroned* (for *enthron’d*) in 11, which has penetrated into too many modern editions. From both these considerations it would appear that the copy—which we call the *Bridgewater MS.*—was made without any careful supervision by the poet. Besides its errors, *Bridgewater* presents many variations which are intentional: these have long since been explained, and no doubt rightly, as a “producer’s” surgery—the familiar process by which a great poem is whittled into an “acting version.” The production took place on Michaelmas night 1634: and the first edition appeared in 1637. Before 1637, however, Milton went over his old MS. (*Trinity a*) and introduced several new readings, thus producing *Trinity β*. The intermediate position of *Bridgewater* between *Trinity a* and *Trinity β* can easily be shown by the many passages in which *Bridgewater* preserves a reading, still visible in *Trinity*, but now erased or marginally corrected. Thus, in 349 *Trinity* gives *lone dungeon* with *lone* altered in favour of *sad*, which in its turn gives way to *close*; *Bridgewater* reads *lone*. In 384 *Trinity* originally read:

walks in black vapours though the noontyde braud
blaze in the summer solstice

This is then erased, and in the left-hand margin Milton substitutes :

benighted walks under y^e midday sun
himselfe is his owne dungeon.

Bridgewater preserves the older reading. There are fifteen examples of the same state of affairs ; so that in 242, where the words preceding to all heav'ns harmonies are (to me) illegibly erased,¹ we can confidently restore them from *Bridgewater's* and hould a counter pointe. The edition of 1637, besides several errors (ll. 20, 73, 131, 417, 443), introduces important novelties. But though Milton did not trouble to copy these novelties into his old, and now very "un-fair," *Trinity* MS., he kept this MS. by him, and made certain further alterations in it after he had sent to the press the new version made for the edition of 1637. Thus, in 214, the old *Trinity* reading, thou flittering angel, is marginally altered to read hovering ; but this alteration was made after the edition of 1637, which preserves flittering. The same phenomenon occurs in 956, where the change from are to grow appears marginally in *Trinity*, but not in 1637. Thus, in addition to *Trinity* α and β , we have a third stratum in the MS.—*Trinity* γ , represented by two corrections only. In 1645 *Comus* was again printed in the *Poems both English and Latin*. The period of serious alteration is now over, but some novelties appear. In 1673 the mask appeared, practically unchanged, in the *Poems upon Several Occasions*.

In *Comus*, therefore, we can watch the growth of a poem through the stages :

Trinity α
Trinity β
1637
Trinity γ
1645.

I neglect *Bridgewater*, whose omissions and re-arrangements tell us more of the poet's patience than of his poethood. Confining myself to the remainder, I propose to draw attention to a certain general characteristic of the revision. It will be best to proceed inductively.

242. *Trin. a. Bridg.* and hould a counterpointe.

Trin. β . 1637. 1645. 1673. and give resounding grace.

Whether the change here is, or is not, from worse to better, it is

¹ I work from Aldis Wright's facsimile. Possibly in the original the old reading may be more easily deciphered ; but it must differ considerably from most of the erasures. It is not a mere "crossing-out," but an attempt at real obliteration.

certainly from the more striking and remarkable to the more ordinary. The rejected reading is more *unexpected*: it has that species of "originality," that power of drawing attention to itself, which would attract a "metaphysical," or a modern, poet. For the moment I will confine myself to reminding the reader that this is almost the one rejected reading in *Trinity* which Milton took the trouble to scratch out illegibly—one might almost say vindictively.

359 *et seq.* *Trin. Bridg.* peace brother peace
I doe not think my sister soe to seeke etc.

1637. 1645. 1673.

Peace, brother, be not over-exquisite
To cast the fashion of uncertain evils;
For grant they be so, while they rest unknown,
What need a man forestall his date of grief
And run to meet what he would most avoid?
Or if they be but false alarms of Fear
How bitter is such self-delusion.
I do not think my sister so to seek, etc.

Here there can be no question that the alteration is undramatic. The passage on the self-sufficiency of virtue which follows is, in any case, a long and improbable suspension of action; but in *Trinity* and *Bridgewater* at least we hasten to it, and, if the main action is delayed, the temperamental conflict between the brothers is given some liveliness by the impatient repetition "peace brother peace." In 1637 even this semblance of drama has disappeared; the Elder Brother lectures rather than argues. Milton is altering his poem so as to make it even less dramatic and more gnomic than it was before.

384. *Trin. a. Bridg.*

walks in black vapours though the noone tyde braud
blaze in the summer solstice

Trin. β. 1637. 1645. 1673.

Benighted walks under the mid-day Sun
Himself in his own dungeon.

Both readings appear to me excellent, but with different kinds of excellence. Neither, of course, is a close copy of the speech of real men; but the earlier, with its natural syntax, and its more highly-coloured pictorial quality—which could be made to seem as if it grew while the brother spoke—might well be thrown off by a good actor with an appearance of realism. The second reading is, from the actor's point of view, vastly inferior. The Latin syntax of

"benighted walks" removes it at once to a different plane. "Himself is his own dungeon" is imaginative, but with the moral imagination; there is no *picture* in it to compare with the blaze of the solstice. Again, the contrast, which the earlier reading makes audible in a "though"-clause, is purely intellectual in the later. Milton is moving further from naturalism; exchanging a sweeter for a drier flavour; becoming (in one of the senses of that word) more classical.

409 *et seq.* Trin a. Bridg.

secure beyond all doubt or question, no :
I could be willinge though now i'th darke to trie
a tough encounter with the shaggiest ruffian
that lurks by hedge or lane of this dead circuit
to have her by my side, though I were suer
she might be free from perill where she is
but where an equall poise of hope and fear, etc.

1637. 1645. 1673.

secure beyond all doubt or controversie
yet where an equall poise of hope and fear, etc.

In this passage *Trinity a* itself is already the correction of a pre-a stage which read *Beshrew me but I would* instead of *I could be willing*, and *passado* instead of *encounter*. The two most racy, and least Miltonic, expressions, had therefore gone the way of *counter-pointe* in 242, before Lawes made his copy: something of energy and facile "point" had already been sacrificed to the unity of Milton's style. What remained, however, was still good theatre; the boyish and noble actor, waving his little sword, with his colloquial *i'th darke* and his picturesque shaggy ruffians and dead circuits, all to be faced in defence of his sister, would to this day be snatched at by any producer anxious to "brighten up" the dialogue at this point. But Milton, as is becoming apparent, did not desire, though he could provide, good theatre. He drops the whole passage. One concession to drama remained: an actor could still make something lively out of *beyond all doubt or question*—No! And Milton could have kept this consistently with the omission of the shaggy ruffians. But he did not; once again the final version, *secure beyond all doubt or controversy*, gives the Elder Brother the purely didactic tone. Instead of the dramatic break we have the purely metrical break of a feminine ending.

605. Trin. Bridg. 1637. monstrous bugs.
1645. 1673. monstrous forms.

We must naturally remove from our minds the ludicrous associations which the earlier form has for a modern reader. These are the "bugs to frighten babes withal" of Spenser. When this has been done, the passage falls into line with the general trend of the alterations. The more forcible, native word, the word that draws attention to itself, is erased in favour of the comparatively colourless loan word. Not so would Donne or D. H. Lawrence have chosen.

608. *Trin. Bridg.* 1637.

by the curls and cleave his scalpe
down to the hipps

1645. 1673. by the curls to a foul death
curs'd as his life.

There is no question which reading has the more "punch" in it. Both are full of energy; but the one is physical energy, demonstrable by the actor, the other is moral. Again Milton moves away from the theatre.

779 *et seq.* In this passage, which is too long to quote in full, the whole of the Lady's exposition of the sage and serious doctrine of virginity appears for the first time in 1637, with a consequent addition to Comus' reply. The original version read

crams and blasphemes his feeder. Co : come, no more.

This constitutes the most important single addition made in the composition of Comus, and it is one without which the tone of the mask would be different. Characteristically, it is an alteration not in the dramatic, but in the gnomic and ethical direction.

847. *Trin a.* and often takes our catell wth strange pinches.
Ceteri omit.

The first version might have come out of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. It belongs to the fairy world of real popular superstition; it breathes a rusticity which has not been filtered through Theocritus and Virgil, and a supernatural which is homely—half comic, half feared—rather than romantic. But Milton has gone as near that world as he chooses to go, in the preceding lines; anything more would be out of the convention in which he is writing. He can just venture on the "urchin blasts"; "pinches" oversteps the line drawn by literary decorum. He therefore cancels the verse.

975 *et seq.* The alterations in the concluding song are probably familiar to most readers and need not be dealt with in detail. It is

enough to say that *Trinity* α and *Bridgewater* both lack what *Trinity* β gives; the contrast, beautifully emphasised by a change of metre (Celestial Cupid her fam'd son advanc't), between terrestrial and celestial love. The new passage, addressed to "mortals" only if their "ears be true" (like its counterpart in the *Apology for Smectymnuus*¹), falls in naturally with the change at ll. 779 *et seq.*, and sums up the increasing gravity of the work in its progress towards the final text. It throws light, moreover, on the famous excised passage which *Trinity* gives us in the prologue. It is true that a sensitive reader can find ample justification for that excision without looking beyond the prologue itself. In the present text we begin with six of the most impressive verses in English poetry; impressive because we pass in a single verse from the cold, tingling, almost unbreathable, region of the aerial spirits² to the *smoak and stir of this dim spot*. Each level, by itself, is a masterly representation: in their juxtaposition ("Either other sweetly gracing") they are irresistible. The intrusion of an intermediate realm, as serene as the air and as warmly inviting as the earth, ruins this effect and therefore justly perished. But its erasure becomes all the more necessary when the poet, with his Platonic stair of earthly and heavenly love, has found the real philosophical intermediary and, with it, the real use for his Hesperean imagery. Having found the true reconciliation he knows that it must come at the end; we must begin with the contrast. Nothing that blurs the distinction between the region of the Spirit and the region of Comus must be admitted until we have passed the "hard assays"; then, and not till then, the more delicious imagery, which had been mere decoration in the opening speech, may be resumed and called into significant life.

In tenui labor. It may seem rash, on the strength of a few alterations, and those minute ones, to speak of a general characteristic in Milton's revision. Yet it is just on such apparent *minutiae* that the total effect of a poem depends; and that there is a common tendency in the alterations I have discussed, few readers will probably dispute. The tendency is one easier, no doubt, to feel than to define. The poet cuts away technical terms and colloquialisms; he will have nothing ebullient; he increases the gnomic element at the expense

¹ *Prose Works*, ed. St. John, vol. iii, p. 117, "Let rude ears be absent."

² It is an interesting question how far Milton regarded them with something more than poetic faith. Certainly his Attendant Spirit, who appears as a *Dæmon* in *Trinity*, has several features in common with the "aereal demons" in Milton's fellow collegiate, Henry More.

of the dramatic. In general, he *subdues*; and he does so in the interests of unity in tone. The process is one of conventionalisation, in this sense only—that the poet, having determined on what plane of convention (at what distance from real life and violent emotion) he is to work, brings everything on to that plane; how many individual beauties he must thereby lose is to him a matter of indifference. As a result we have that dearly bought singleness of quality—

smooth and full as if one gush
Of life had washed it—

which sets *Comus*, for all its lack of human interest, in a place apart and unapproachable.

Whether Milton's aim was a good one—whether he paid too high a price for it and sacrificed better things for its sake—these are questions that each will answer according to his philosophy. But if we blame *Comus* for its lack of dramatic quality, it is, at least, relevant to remember that Milton could have made it—nay, originally had made it—more lively than it is; that he laboured to produce the quality we condemn and knowingly jettisoned something of that whose absence we deplore. It is arguable that he chose wrongly; but the example of what may be called poetic chastity—an example “set the first in English”—deserves attention.

PILLS TO PURGE MELANCHOLY

By CYRUS L. DAY

ONE of the most entertaining of eighteenth-century poetical miscellanies is the six-volume collection of songs and ballads entitled *Wit and Mirth : Or Pills To Purge Melancholy*. The first volume of this well-known series was published in 1698 and the last in 1720, and its popularity during the intervening years would be difficult to exaggerate. The Princess Caroline of Anspach owned a set ;¹ Addison referred to its success and admired its facetious title ;² and Gay drew from it over half the tunes in *The Beggar's Opera*.³ More recently students of old English music and popular literature have, like Gay, found in the *Pills* a fruitful source of rare and sometimes elsewhere inaccessible material. Since the time of Chappell and Ebsworth, indeed, the collection has been repeatedly ransacked by literary investigators—though it is remarkable how many interesting facts relative to the contents and bibliography of the various volumes have been overlooked. Thus, in the fifth volume⁴ of the 1714 edition there is a full-length modernisation of *The Miller's Tale* which does not appear to have been noticed by bibliographers of Chaucer.⁵ Other omissions and misconceptions will be pointed out in the course of the present article.

The first volume of the first edition of *Pills* was published on Monday, November 21, 1698,⁶ but post-dated 1699. Like all subsequent volumes in the series it is a compact duodecimo of over three-hundred numbered pages and contains the words and generally also the music of some two hundred songs and ballads. Henry Playford assembled, edited, and published the collection, and his initials stand at the end of both the dedication to the "Votary's to

¹ Now in the British Museum.

² *The Guardian*, No. 29, April 14, 1713.

³ Cf. W. E. Schultz, *Gay's Beggar's Opera*, 1923, 306-41.

⁴ Pp. 325-43.

⁵ The modernisation is anonymous and of little merit. It is 713 lines long and has no relation, apparently, to Samuel Cobb's version published in 1712 as *The Carpenter of Oxford, Or, The Miller's Tale, From Chaucer*.

⁶ *The Post Boy*, Nos. 562 and 564.

Bacchus" and the prefatory verses by "The Stationer on the Book." The latter, it is perhaps worth noting, are borrowed from *An Antidote against Melancholy* (1661), where they are signed "N. D.,"¹ and Playford had already used them himself in *Wit and Mirth. An Antidote against Melancholy* (1682 and 1684). Both of these collections have been erroneously identified with *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills To Purge Melancholy*.

Playford's venture seems to have been a success, for he announced a second volume in the term catalogues as early as Easter 1699, and again in Michaelmas Term of the same year.² More than twelve months elapsed, however, before the second volume was finally published on Saturday, July 27, 1700.³ Playford again signed the dedication, and Tom Brown and William Pittis contributed verses congratulating him on the success of his first, and the publication of his second, "Book of Pills."

Two more volumes and a second edition of the first volume came out before Playford retired from the publishing business; but none of them seems to have survived. Volume III was announced in the term catalogues for Michaelmas Term, 1701,⁴ promised for the following term, and priced at eighteen-pence instead of at half-a-crown, like the former volumes. It was evidently issued in three instalments, the first on Tuesday, March 3, 1702,⁵ but the last two not until June 1703,⁶ more than a year later. Each instalment cost sixpence, or the three bound together, two shillings.

A second edition of Volume I was published on Wednesday, July 22, 1702,⁷ and a fourth volume was finally published on August 6, 1706.⁸ But only the first two of the volumes issued by Playford are extant, and of these the copies in the British Museum are, I suppose, unique.

¹ There are verses by "N. D." in John Playford's *Select Ayres & Dialogues*, 1669, iii, 41; and the preface to his *Choice Songs and Ayres For One Voyce* (1673) is signed "N. D." Furthermore, since Playford published the 1669 edition of *An Antidote against Melancholy* (cf. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers*, ed. Eyre, 1913, ii, 394), it is probable that he also published the 1661 edition. The initials "N. D.," accordingly, may stand for John Playford.

² *The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, 1906, iii, 123 and 157.

³ *The Post Boy*, No. 827.

⁴ *The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, 1906, iii, 273.

⁵ *The Post Boy*, No. 1060.

⁶ *The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, 1906, iii, 359.

⁷ *The Post Boy*, Nos. 1121 and 1122.

⁸ *The Post Man*, No. 1654. Cf. also *The Diverting Post*, February 1706, p. 10, in which Playford advertises that "The 4th and last Dose of Pills, which will make the first Vol. compleat, will be speedily Publish'd."

In 1707 John Young took the collection over and on February 1¹ published a new four-volume edition. Volume I, which is correctly called a third edition, has five new songs, and the order of a few others is altered. Volumes II and III are second editions, the former being identical in contents with Volume II of the 1700 edition. Volume IV seems to have been regarded as a first edition, though it is not so designated, and it may not improbably be, therefore, a reissue of Playford's fourth volume, which was first published only six months before.

From time to time Young republished separate volumes of *Pills*—for instance, a second edition of Volume IV in 1709 with five new songs, all of which deal with contemporary political events. In 1712 he brought out a third edition of Volumes II and III, and in 1714 a fourth edition of Volume I. Young also added a fifth volume to the series on June 26, 1714.² All of these volumes of Young's, it may be remarked, are now excessively rare.

In 1719-1720, after a lapse of five years, Jacob Tonson published a final edition of *Pills* in six volumes. The songs were drastically re-arranged, and more than two hundred new ones, all written by Thomas D'Urfey, were added. These, together with nearly all the songs by D'Urfey which had already been included in the collection, were carefully brought together in Volumes I and II. Seventeen songs, among them some old and meritorious ones, were omitted—unintentionally, one would like to believe.³

A good deal of confusion has arisen from the fact that two issues of the 1719-1720 edition can be distinguished. The first issue has the title *Songs Compleat, Pleasant and Divertive* and consists of but five volumes. Printed by subscription, it was delivered to subscribers on Thursday, March 26, 1719.⁴ D'Urfey's name appears on the title-pages of Volumes I and II (in which, as I have pointed out, his songs are assembled), and also, erroneously, on the title-page of

¹ *The Post Man*, No. 1732.

² *The Post Boy*, No. 2985.

³ The following songs were left out of the 1719-1720 edition: "As it fell on a holiday," "We be soldiers three," "Martin said to his man," "Who liveth so merry in all this land," and "Willy prithe go to bed" (all five of which are from Ravenscroft's *Deuteromelia*, 1609); also "Sir John got him an ambling nag," "I love thee for thy fickleness," "A young man late that lacked a mate," "In our yard in frosts and snows," "Still near bright Celia," "Whenas King Harry ruled this land," "In the morning ere 'twas light," "If Rosamond that was so fair," "If she that was fair London's pride," "Spring invites the troops to warring," "Of a worthy London prentice," and "A rich old cuff, a carpenter by trade."

⁴ *The Post Boy*, No. 4627.

Volume III. The running-title throughout is *Songs Compleat, Pleasant and Divertive*.

The second issue was printed from the same type as the first, and with the following exceptions is identical with it.¹ First, the *Songs Compleat, Pleasant and Divertive* title-pages were withdrawn and *Wit and Mirth : Or Pills To Purge Melancholy* title-pages substituted ; and second, the running-title in all volumes was changed to *Pills to Purge Melancholy*.² Finally, a sixth volume, also called *Wit and Mirth : Or Pills To Purge Melancholy*, was added in 1720.

The 1719-1720 edition was reprinted in the nineteenth century, and it is through this reprint that the *Pills* are most generally known. Neither the publisher nor the date is specified, but the set in the New York Public Library is rubber-stamped 1876, and it probably came out shortly before that. A peculiar feature of the reprint is the fact that it is a hybrid. Volumes II and VI, that is to say, are of the *Wit and Mirth : Or Pills To Purge Melancholy* variety, while Volumes I, III, IV, and V belong to the earlier, or *Songs Compleat, Pleasant and Divertive* issue. Evidently in making the reprint a broken set, consisting partly of one issue and partly of the other, was used.

Thomas D'Urfey's connection with *Pills To Purge Melancholy* has been very generally misunderstood. Only too frequently he has been described as the editor or even the author of the whole series, with the unfortunate result that several songs have been fathered upon him which he did not, in fact, produce. Such errors are natural enough, perhaps, for as early as 1705 the anonymous author of *Visits from the Shades*³ imagined the ghost of Thomas Heywood as saying to D'Urfey ; " your bad Compositions outbalance your good ones above three to one, without the Addition of your *Pills to purge Melancholy*." But though D'Urfey was the most voluminous single contributor to all the volumes from 1698 to 1714, he did not himself edit any of them until 1719.

¹ That the second issue, like the first, originally consisted of but five volumes is revealed by a preliminary title-page in the first volume of some sets which contains the words, " In Five Volumes. The Fourth Edition."

² As to the priority of the *Songs Compleat, Pleasant and Divertive* issue, a Grolier Club publication entitled *Contributions to English Bibliography*, 1905, i, 271, calls attention to a curious bit of evidence : " It is probable that, after a few copies of the first five volumes had been issued, the title and head-lines were changed to read uniformly with that of the sixth volume. That the title ' Songs Compleat,' etc., was the earlier of the two issues is shown by the fact that the catch word at the end of the ' Table' in each of the five volumes still remained ' Songs,' while the running title was changed to read, ' Pills to Purge Melancholy.' "

³ I, 76-77.

I have already referred to the verses by Tom Brown and William Pittis congratulating Playford on the publication of his second "Book of Pills," and there is ample evidence that Playford rather than D'Urfey edited all the volumes from 1698 to 1706. Thus in 1701 Pittis contributed prefatory verses to another song-book of Playford's, *The Second Book of the Pleasant Musical Companion*, in which he averred that Playford's "last Attempt" (by which, a footnote informs us, he meant *Pills To Purge Melancholy*) was "well design'd, And gain'd it's wish'd effect on ev'ry Mind." Again, *Apollo's Feast* (1703) was "Collected," according to the title-page, and "Published by the Author of *Pills to purge Melancholy*." Now Playford published *Apollo's Feast*,¹ and it follows that he must have been the "Author [or, as we should say, the editor] of *Pills to purge Melancholy*."

The volumes themselves corroborate this testimony. In the 1719-1720 edition D'Urfey's hand is for the first time in evidence. His name is on the title-pages of the first three volumes of the first issue, and at the end of the dedication; the first two volumes are made up exclusively of his own compositions;² and he speaks of himself in the first person in the titles of a large number of songs and poems.³ In the earlier volumes, from 1698 to 1714, on the contrary, no such signs of editing by D'Urfey appear. His songs in these volumes are numerous enough, but when they are attributed to him the third person is invariably used; and indeed it is quite clear that his editorial connection with the work began and ended with the 1719-1720 edition.

The songs and ballads in the *Pills* were derived from a wide variety of sources.⁴ Many of them were theatre-songs which in most cases had probably already been printed as broadsides or on single sheets from engraved copper plates.⁵ Others were from

¹ Arber (*The Term Catalogues*, 1906, iii, 337) incorrectly assigns *Apollo's Feast* to D'Urfey.

² There is one exception to this statement. "Chloe found Amyntas lying," 1719, i, 328-29, is by Dryden, and must have been included unintentionally in the first volume. Some six or eight songs by D'Urfey, furthermore, seem to have been overlooked, and are scattered through the last four volumes.

³ For instance, "*A Mad Dialogue. Sung in my Play, call'd the Richmond Heiress*," 1719, i, 73; and "*The Bonny Milk-Maid. Sung in my Play of Don Quixote*," 1719, i, 237. It would be useless to multiply examples.

⁴ I am at present engaged upon a study of the *Pills* in which I hope to go into this matter more thoroughly.

⁵ Single songs sold for a penny apiece, and were extremely popular. In *Mercurius Musicus* for May and June 1701, there is an advertisement of the first two volumes of *Pills*, in which, it is affirmed, "you will find most of the single Songs that has been Cutt on Copper for these Ten Years Past."

drolleries like *Sportive Wit* (1656) and *Merry Drollery* (1661); from courtesy-books like *The New Academy of Complements* (1671) and *The Compleat Courtier* (1683); or from folio song-books like *The Banquet of Music* (1688-1692) and *Thesaurus Musicus* (1693-1696).

One work in particular, *Wit and Mirth. An Antidote against Melancholy*, a drollery published by Henry Playford in 1682 and again in 1684, must be considered the ancestor of *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills To Purge Melancholy*. The similarity of the two titles, of course, is very striking, especially in view of the fact that Playford was the editor and publisher of both collections. And it is significant that thirty-eight out of seventy-four, or more than half,¹ of the songs in the 1684 *Antidote* were subsequently included in the various volumes of *Pills*. Only one other work, the fifth volume of *Choice Ayres & Songs* (1684), furnished such a large proportion of its songs (thirty-three out of fifty-seven) to the *Pills*.

The origin of the title *Pills To Purge Melancholy* is an interesting but comparatively unimportant question. The immediate suggestion may have come from *An Antidote against Melancholy* (1661), either directly or through the medium of Henry Playford's drolleries of 1682 and 1684. The medical figure, to be sure, scarcely needs the explanation of a source, though as a matter of fact Playford's very phrase had already been in common use for more than a hundred years. Sir John Harington, in the prologue to *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596), speaks of a young gentleman's "having taken some three or foure score pills to purge melancholie"; and in *A Pleasant Comedie, Called The Two Merry Milke-Maids* (1620)² occur the lines:

O Sir, let not your modestie wrong you,
I wud you had a Pill to purge Melancholy.

In 1628, as Ebsworth notes,³ the figure turns up in Robert Hayman's *Quodlibets*:⁴

Though thou maist call my merriments, my folly,
They are my Pills to purge my melancholly,
They would purge thine too, wert not thou Foole-holy.

A surprisingly large number of works both of earlier and later date than Playford's collection have titles similar to the one he chose; and as some of them have been confused with *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills To Purge Melancholy*, I venture to append the following list

¹ This figure does not include the forty-four catches at the end of the volume.

² Sig. D4^v.

³ *An Antidote against Melancholy*, ed. Ebsworth, 1876, 165.

⁴ P. 49.

with a minimum of discussion. The titles of books which I have not myself consulted, and which are probably in many cases no longer extant, are enclosed in brackets.

[*A Pil to purge Melancholie : or a preprative to a purgation, c. 1599.*] Described by Haslewood in *The British Bibliographer*, 1810, i, 149-152. Cf. also *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, 1908, iv, 374.

Thomas Ford, *Musicke of Sundrie Kindes*, 1607. No. 18 in Part II is entitled "M. Richard Martins Thumpe" and headed "A Pill to purge Melancholie."

[Thomas Jordan, *A Pill to purge Melancholy*, 1637.] Entered in the stationers' register, November 10, 1637. Cf. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, ed. Arber, 1876, iv, 397.

[*A Pil to purge Melancholy*, 1652.] Cf. *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Cambridge, 1911, vii, 516.

Musicks Recreation On The Lyra Viol, 1652. No. 11 is headed "A Pill to Purge Melancholy."

[*A pill to purge melancholy*, 1656.] Entered in the stationers' register, March 15, 1656. Cf. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers*, ed. Eyre, 1913, ii, 37.

An Antidote against Melancholy : Made up in Pills, 1661. The running-title is "Pills to purge Melancholy."

Antidotum Melancholiae, 1668.

[*An Antidote against Melancholy, made up in Pills*, 1669.] Entered in the stationers' register by J. Playford, January 1, 1669. Cf. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers*, ed. Eyre, 1913, ii, 394.

[*The Cabinet of Mirth, or The Second Part of "The Antidote against Melancholy,"* 1674.] Entered in the term catalogues, May 26, 1674. Cf. *The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, 1903, i, 172.

Wit and Mirth. An Antidote against Melancholy, 1682. Another issue with the addition of twenty-six songs and catches appeared in 1684.

[*The merry Companion, or The Second Part of the "Antidote against Melancholy,"* 1686.] Entered in the term catalogues, Easter and Trinity, 1686. Cf. *The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, 1905, ii, 168.

J. Franck, *Remedium Melancholiae, Or The Remedy of Melancholy*, 1690.

[*Laugh and be Fat, or An Antidote against Melancholy*, 1700.] Editions of this are entered in the term catalogues for Hilary Term, 1700, Michaelmas Term, 1700, and Easter Term, 1711. Cf. *The Term Catalogues*, ed. Arber, 1906, iii, 174, 218, and 679. An edition was published on March 24, 1705, and advertised in *The Observer*, vol. iii, No. 98. Editions dated 1733 and 1753 are in the British Museum (shelf-mark 12352. a. 20) and the Bodleian Library (shelf-mark Douce M.M. 300) respectively.

A Pill to purge State-Melancholy, 1715.

Tory Pills to purge Whig Melancholy, 1715.

[*A Pill to purge State-Melancholy*, the third edition, 1716.] Cf.

Catalogue of English Song Books Forming a Portion of the Library of Sir John Stainer, 1891, 67.

Pills to Purge State-Melancholy: Part the Second, 1718. This is identical with *A Collection of State Songs, Poems, &c.*, 1716.

[*South-Sea Pills to purge Court Melancholy*, 1721.] This was published by Curll on March 16, 1721, and advertised in *The Post Boy*, No. 4937.

[*The Merry Musician; or, Pills to Purge Melancholy Reviv'd*, n.d.] Cf. *Catalogue of English Song Books Forming a Portion of the Library of Sir John Stainer*, 1891, 52.

An Antidote against Melancholy, 1749.

Pills To purge Melancholy; Or Englands Witty and Merry Jester, c. 1750.

Pills to expel Spleen; Or A Cure for the Vapours, c. 1752.

Edwin's Pills To Purge Melancholy. . . The Second Edition, 1788.

A third edition was published in 1789.

Laugh and grow fat; or, A cure for Melancholy, 1797.

[*The Buck's Delight; or, Pills to purge Melancholy*, 1798.] Cf. *Catalogue of English Song Books Forming a Portion of the Library of Sir John Stainer*, 1891, 16.

An Antidote against Melancholy Compounded of Choice Poems, Jovial Songs, Merry Ballads, and Witty Parodies, Pratt Manufacturing Company, New York, 1884.

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE RESEARCH

THE EQUITY SIDE OF CHANCERY, 1558-1714

By MARGARET DOWLING

VALUABLE work has already been done in the field of literary research among Public Record Office documents, and there is room for a great deal more. Much remains undone or uncompleted through ignorance of the indexes and cross-references used at the Record Office, which often makes research both difficult and unfruitful. This article is intended to assist those engaged in research among the records of law-suits in the equity side of Chancery, 1558-1714, and to explain, as far as possible, how documents pertaining to these suits may be obtained, and what significance they have.

The chief business of the court of Chancery was to receive and judge petitions in cases of assault, trespass and a variety of outrages for which, although they were within the jurisdiction of Common Law, the petitioner was unable to obtain redress. The chief obstacle in the way of gaining remedy at Common Law was that the procedure was strictly formal: If, for example, a person charged with theft could prove that the object stolen by him was not exactly as described by the complainant then the case against him collapsed. The numerous miscarriages of justice resulting from this narrow procedure could be remedied by litigation in the court of Chancery, which administered the law with equity in view. The actual object stolen was of little account; the point was that a theft had been made, for which equity demanded redress.

The procedure in early Chancery equity suits was absolutely different from what it is to-day. The case was nearly finished before it was heard in court. It is true that such orders as those commanding a reply by the defendant, appointing certain persons to examine witnesses, or giving permission for the depositions to be made public could be obtained from the court by counsel, but the making of these orders was looked upon as part of the necessary formal preliminaries to the hearing of the case. There was, however,

no public examination or cross-examination of witnesses; all evidence was taken before the case was heard. On the day appointed for the hearing each counsel put before the judge or judges the facts of his client's case. His statement was based upon evidence obtained from witnesses and upon facts asserted by his client to be true. The judges then decided in favour of one of the parties and passed judgment. If, however, the judges after receiving evidence felt unable to make a decision, the matter was referred to a Master of the court who investigated it and reported to the court what decree or judgment should, in his opinion, be made. This report often, but not always, guided the court in making a decision.

The documents which are described in the following pages are those which record an early Chancery suit *in full*. But it is unusual to find a document of each class for one particular suit. Often the case ends abruptly after the Bill or Answer and no order recording this end appears to have been made. Sometimes it is clear from a record in one class of document that a record in another class ought to exist, but has not been preserved.

"CHANCERY PROCEEDINGS" ¹

The first move in a Chancery suit was for the plaintiff to prefer a *Bill*, signed by his counsel, in the form of a petition to the Lord Chancellor, Lord Keeper or Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal.² In this document he stated his grievance and asked that, by a writ of subpœna³ granted under the Great Seal of England, the defendant should be compelled to send in an *Answer* to his complaint, making reply to his accusations. If the defendant did not obey, an attachment against him was awarded by the court to the Sheriff of his county as a further step towards obtaining a reply. This was really a warning to appear in court by a certain date and did not lead to actual arrest. If the defendant was not to be found (*i.e.* was pronounced *non est inventus* by the Sheriff) then a Commission of

¹ Chancery Pleadings, *i.e.* the bills and answers by which a suit was begun, are indexed by the P.R.O. as *Chancery Proceedings*—a somewhat misleading title as the term "proceedings" really refers to all the documents for a case.

² If the Crown was a plaintiff, either in its own behalf or for someone under its protection, the complaint was presented as "information" by the proper official, usually the Attorney-General.

³ The defendant was served with the writ of subpœna, demanding his attendance in court on a specified day, by a messenger of the court who was required to declare by affidavit that he had done so.

Rebellion against him was "directed to certain persons, to the end they, three, two or one of them apprehend the party or cause him to be apprehended as a *rebel* and contemner of the King's laws, wheresoever found within the kingdom, and bring or cause him to be brought to the court on a day therein assigned." As a rebel his property was liable to confiscation.

Another method of procedure was for the defendant to send in a *Demurrer*, or form of plea, by which exception was taken to the *Bill*, stating that even if it was correct in point of fact, yet in point of law it could not be upheld. In most cases the plaintiff's counsel objected to the *Demurrer* as being "insufficient" and asked that the defendant should be compelled to present a full *Answer*. The court then either ordered the defendant to reply or referred the matter to a Master of the court (see *Reports and Certificates* below) for consideration. His opinion, which was in favour of one of the two parties, was usually accepted by the court and an order made embodying that opinion.

Even if an *Answer* were sent in the plaintiff could, if he so wished, dispute its "sufficiency" and, by the procedure already cited in the case of no *Answer*, compel the defendant to send in a fuller reply.

For the most part the *Proceedings*, i.e. the preliminary Bills and replies, end with the *Answer*; fairly often one finds a *Replication* and *Rejoinder* made by the plaintiff and defendant respectively. Very rarely the parties indulged in a *Surrejoinder*, *Rebutter* and *Surrebutter*! The main facts of the case are usually given in the *Bill* and *Answer*; ¹ the other replies do not often yield a great deal of additional information—their main business was apparently to declare the other party "most false & untrew," but they establish dates which are useful in tracing further records of the case, such as the depositions of witnesses, orders recording the progress of the suit after it went into court, and the final decree and judgment.

The work of filing the original documents of *Chancery Proceedings* was assigned to certain officials of the court, known as the Six Clerks, ² who were the official medium between the solicitors and the court. It is uncertain exactly what system of filing was employed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but it is known

¹ If there were more defendants than one, either a joint reply or separate answers might be sent in. In the latter case a certain amount of different information was given by each of the defendants.

² The Six Clerks were abolished by Stat. 5 and 6 Vict., and their duties transferred to the Clerks of Records and Writs.

that about 1635 the business of the Six Clerks Office was divided so that suits in which the first plaintiff's name began with letters A, B,¹ F and Y were given to two of the Six Clerks; letters E, G to O to two others, and letters P to X and Z to the remaining two, but it is fairly certain that eventually the appropriate Sworn Clerk² attached to any particular Six Clerk filed the Bills, etc., with his Six Clerk, without reference to this alphabetical order. Samuel Reynardson, Six Clerk, 1734-97, used a more orderly and complicated system of filing, which may of course have been in use before his appointment to office. A description of this system is given by S. R. Scargill-Bird:³

When a Bill was brought into the Office to be filed it was delivered to one of the subordinates (who were called Sworn Clerks in Court) of any one of the Six Clerks, who thereupon entered the names of the plaintiff and defendant, together with that of his principal and his own names, in the *Bill Book*,⁴ which was always kept open in the office for that purpose. The Six Clerk, whose name was thus entered in the *Bill Book*, became thenceforward the "Plaintiff's Six Clerk in Court." The Bill was then taken into the study of the Six Clerk to whom it belonged and placed upon the File, where it remained until an appearance⁵ was entered for one of the defendants.

The Sworn Clerk or Clerk in Court for the Defendant making appearance then took the Bill off the File, and made a copy for his client, keeping the Bill in his possession until the Defendant's Answer was drawn up, when the Bill with Answer annexed was redelivered to the Six Clerk of the Plaintiff. These Bills and Answers were kept in the Six Clerk's study during six clear Terms for purposes of reference, after which period they were taken down to the Record Rooms and sorted alphabetically

¹ The letters C and D are omitted from this list, and I have been unable to find an explanation for the omission.

² Each Six Clerk was generally assisted by ten Sworn Clerks who were in consequence known as a whole as the Sixty Clerks.

³ *A Guide to the Various Classes of Documents preserved in the Public Record Office*, p. 48.

⁴ There are Bill Books preserved from 1673 onwards in MS. volumes, those for 1673-1713 being very imperfect. Entries of the Bills filed are arranged alphabetically year by year. The names of the Six Clerks and Clerks in Court who appeared for the plaintiffs are given in the margin. The searcher can thus refer to the Division in which the records should be indexed, also to the Cause Books and Clerk in Court's Books.

The Cause Books, which are preserved from 1620 onwards contain records made by each of the Six Clerks—alphabetically under the plaintiff's name—of the proceedings in every suit, *i.e.* the names of the plaintiffs and their legal representatives, and the date when any of the proceedings were filed.

A descriptive list of the other extant papers relating to the administration of the Six Clerks office is given in the Chancery Class List, p. 154 (Literary Search Room, Press 24/26; Legal Search Room, Press C). These papers start with the reign of Elizabeth.

⁵ Namely, the appearance of the defendant in court or some one for him as surety of his good faith in the matter.

into bundles according to the plaintiff's names. If more than one Answer was made to a Bill, such subsequent Answers were not generally annexed to the Bill like the first Answer, but were filed with Records of the Term in which they were made. It, however, frequently happened that when Answers were taken away by the Plaintiff's Clerk in Court to be copied they were not returned to the Six Clerk for many years, and consequently never put into their proper bundles. In the case of the death of any such Clerk in Court the Records in his custody were delivered to the Six Clerk whom he represented; but not being in the proper order or method observed by the Six Clerks in keeping their records, were arranged alphabetically under the general head of "Pleadings," by which title they were distinguished from the "Study Matters" or proceedings taken annually from the Six Clerk's Study; consequently in a suit of long standing a search for the various Answers has to be continued from bundle to bundle for a considerable period. Moreover, when a Bill was amended it was removed from its old bundle and placed on the File as if it were a fresh Bill; but the preceding Answers were not removed from their bundles, and consequently, after finding an Answer, it may become necessary to search forwards to find the Bill to which it belongs. The "Single Bills," or Bills to which no appearance was entered, were put in bundles by themselves and kept distinct from the "Study Matters" or "Pleadings." It frequently happened that when a Bill was taken off the File for the purpose of being copied, the Clerk in Court who so removed it did not return it directly to the Six Clerk from whose File it was taken, but instead passed it on to one of the other Clerks in Court or Sworn Clerks who appeared for some other Defendant, and if no Answer happened to be filed by such last-mentioned Clerk in Court the Bill was never returned to the Plaintiff's Six Clerk at all, but remained in the custody of the Clerk in Court to whom it had been delivered, and was in due course put away with the Records of the Six Clerk whom he represented. It thus often becomes necessary, if a Bill is not found in the Division of the Six Clerk with whom it was filed, to continue the research from Division to Division of the remaining Clerks.

The easiest method of research in Chancery is to start with the name of a person who interests you. The next step is to tackle the indexes of Chancery Proceedings. These are kept in Press 24¹ of the Literary Room and in Press C of the Legal Room. Those necessary for the period 1558-1714 are:

SERIES I²

Elizabeth

(a) A Calendar printed in 3 vols. with Indexes of all names and places at end. Incomplete. (24/43-45a; C7-9).

¹ Press references will be given by number to indicate Literary Room, e.g. 24/46-9, and by letter to indicate Legal Room, e.g. C10. Absence of reference signifies absence of Index volumes in one of the rooms.

² Series I and II deal with different suits.

(b) An Index Nominum, *i.e.* the suits arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name, in 1 Volume MS. (C10). This contains references to the suits listed in (a) and also to those which are omitted there.

James I

(a) A Calendar printed in 1 Vol. MS. A-K¹ (24/45*b* ; C13).

(b) An Index Nominum in 1 Vol. MS. (C11).

(c) An Index Locorum, *i.e.* the places mentioned in the suits, in 3 Vols. MS. (C12*a*-12*c*).

Charles I

(a) An Index Nominum printed in 4 Vols. (24/46-9).

(b) An Index Nominum in 4 Vols. MS. (C15-18).

These two indexes contain references to the same suits.

SERIES II

A Calendar printed in 3 Vols. :

Vol. I : 1558-79 (24/50 ; C22).

Vol. II : 1579-1621 (24/51 ; C23).

Vol. III : 1621-60 (24/52 ; C24).

SIX CLERKS SERIES.

Bridges : ² 1613-1714. Alphabetical Calendar printed in 4 Vols. (24/57*a*-57*d* ; C25-28).

Collins : *c.* 1625-1714. Index in 11 Vols. MS. (C29*a*-29*k*).

Hamilton : *c.* 1620-1714. Alphabetical Calendar in 14 Vols. MS. (C32*a*-35*e*).

Mitford : *c.* 1570-1714. Alphabetical Calendar in 14 Vols. MS. (C36-49).

Reynardson : 1649-1714. Index printed in 2 Vols. (24/53, 54 ; C50, 51).

Whittington : *c.* 1640-1714. Alphabetical Calendar in 14 Vols. MS. (C52*a*-54*d*).

Some of these list only the surname of plaintiff and defendant, but most of them give full names, date and subject of dispute.

It is useful to remember :

(1) That although several indexes cover the same period they refer, with the exception of the two sets of Series I, *Charles I*, to absolutely different collections of documents. It follows, therefore,

¹ The volume including plaintiffs whose names begin with the initials L-Z has not yet been printed.

² The six names given here are those of Six Clerks who were in office together between the years 1738 and 1747. Probably at some time during this period the documents of each of their divisions were sorted and indexed.

that to find a suit which was brought in 1632 it is necessary to search Indexes Series I, *Charles I*, Series II, Vol. III, and the Six Clerks Series with the exception of *Reynardson*.

(2) That the suits are arranged alphabetically under plaintiffs. Therefore, if you wish to find suits in which the man in whom you are interested is a defendant, there is no other course than to read through the list of defendants in all Indexes for the appropriate period.

(3) That if general information is required, it may be obtained either through examination of the original documents or by the patient reading of calendars, whereby reference can be obtained to likely documents.

(4) That a specimen reference for the filling-up of application tickets is given in the front of each Index volume.

DECREES AND ORDERS

Entry Books of *Decrees and Orders* were kept by the Registrars of the court of Chancery, whose duty it was to attend the Court, and to record the orders, decrees, and dismissions which they entered in Registers. The entries were intended to form a complete history of every case; to record, for example, an order for the defendant to reply, or the matter to be referred to a Master of the Court (see *Reports and Certificates* below). The date for the recording of affidavits or depositions, of the hearing, the final decree and the judgment were all to be noted. These entries, which are not always of value in themselves, often indicate whether it is necessary to examine reports, affidavits or depositions, and give the date when information may be gained from any of these sources.

The "Report Office" was a branch of the Registrar's Office, and in it were received and filed all Reports and Certificates made by the Masters. . . . To it on the first day of Michaelmas term in each year were transferred the Decrees and Orders of the previous year, and in the Report Office were kept the Entry Books of Decrees and Orders from the time of Henry VIII, inclusive.¹

The Entry Books are divided into two series, *Reg. Lib. A* and *Reg. Lib. B*, each containing entries of Decrees and Orders from A to Z (being the initial letter of the plaintiff's name), inclusive until the end of Trinity term 1629. After that date the *A* series contains the letters A-K only and the *B* series those from L to Z only. Until

¹ S. R. Scargill-Bird, *ibid*, p. 9.

1629 the *A* and *B* series cover the same period, book by book, but as they are not exact duplicates it is unwise not to search through both series.

The actual method of gaining information from the Entry Books is as follows :

Having found the date of a suit and the parties involved, the next step is to turn to the list of Indexes to Decrees and Orders (*Catalogue of Lists and Indexes*, Chancery section ; Press 15/55A, page 39). This gives references to the Indexes of the Entry Books, year by year, *e.g.*

Year	Series	Index
1560	A	1402
"	B	1403
1561	A	1404
"	B	1405

Both Indexes and Entry Books begin in the Michaelmas term of each year ; therefore Index 1402 refers to Michaelmas term 1560, Hilary term 1560/1, Easter and Trinity terms 1561.

It is necessary to examine Indexes¹ which begin immediately after the filing of the *Bill* and to continue until no further action is recorded. As it is by no means unusual to find a lapse of two years between entries, and as cases often extended over many years it is obvious that an extensive search must be made.

The Index books are divided into terms ; the suits are arranged alphabetically under plaintiffs, giving folio reference to the corresponding Entry Books. For a case having more than one person in each party the Index may refer quite inconsistently to any or all of the plaintiffs or defendants. For example, in such a suit as *Henry Evans and Alexander Hawkins v. Edward Kirkham and Thomas Kendall*, the reference may be given as *Evans v. Kirkham*, *Hawkins v. Kendall*, *Evans v. Kendall*, etc.

Having obtained the necessary folio references, turn to the list of Entry Books of Decrees and Orders (*Chancery Class List*, p. 60 ; Press 24/26) which is arranged with cross-references to year, series and Entry Books, *e.g.*

No. of Entry Bk.	Year	
23	3 & 4 Eliz : 1561	A
24	" "	B

¹ To apply for Indexes to Decrees and Orders it is not necessary to give more than the Index number, *e.g.* Index 1402.

The Class reference to Chancery Decrees and Orders is C33. Therefore to obtain Entry Book A, 1561, application must be made as follows : C33/23.

It is useful to note that folio references are not always exact. The required order or decree may be on an earlier or later folio. Further, the indexes are not always complete.

DECREE ROLLS

The following extract quoted from Giuseppi : *Guide to the Public Records*, Vol. I, p. 53, explains the nature of Decree Rolls at a later date ; probably a similar method was used during the period under discussion.

The Decree Rolls contain such Decrees, Orders, Dismissions of the Court of Chancery, &c., as were *enrolled*, generally in order to render the record of the judgment more solemn and authoritative, any appeal against such Decrees or Orders having then to be made to the House of Lords. Any Decree or Order of the Court of Chancery (and also orders by the Ecclesiastical Court in England "Directing payment of any sum of money," and orders of the Court of Chancery of Ireland, and of the Incumbered Estates Court, Ireland, of a similar nature) might be enrolled within six months from the date thereof, but not later without special leave of the Court, and no enrolment of any Decree, &c., was allowed after the expiration of five years from the date thereof. In order to obtain the enrolment of any Decree or Order a *Docquet of Enrolment*, setting forth the preliminary proceedings, and reciting the Decree or Order to be enrolled, was drawn up, which Docquet, after having been inspected by one of the Clerks of Records and Writs,¹ was signed by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Keeper, or Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal for the time being, and without such signature no Decree or Order could be enrolled.

It would appear from the above remarks that a Decree was enrolled upon application from one of the parties—probably the successful one.

CALENDARS AND INDEXES

- 14 Vols. MS., one of which is an Index Locorum.
- Vol. I, Henry VIII-Eliz. (N1).
- Vol. II, Eliz.-Chas. I (N6).
- Vol. III, Jas. I-Chas. II (N7).
- Vol. IV, Jas. I-Geo. I (N8).

¹ The successors of the Six Clerks.

Vol. V, Jas. I-Geo. I (N₉).

Vol. VI, Chas. I-Geo. II (N₁₀).

Vol. VII, Chas. II-Geo. III (N. 11).

Vol. VIII, Jas. I-Anne (N₁₂).

Vol. IX, Chas. II-Geo. II (N₁₃).

Index Locorum to Vols. I-X (N₁₅).

Calendar Jas. I-Geo. III (N₁₆).

Supplementary Index Volume, c. 1600-1800 (N₁₇).

These indexes are arranged alphabetically under plaintiffs, with references to date, roll and number, *e.g.*

04 Kirkham (No. 228) Ēdrus q' u's Burbage Ricad' & at defend ^{1ac' Pars}_{10 086}

In this case of Edward Kirkham v. Richard Burbage and others, 04 indicates the suit to be fourth on the original roll; the modern reference number of the roll is 228, and the date is 1613. Application for the original roll should be made as follows: C78/228.

REPORTS AND CERTIFICATES

It has already been stated that certain points arising from Chancery suits were submitted to a Master¹ of the court for his investigation. He was called upon to decide whether Bills, Answers, etc., were sufficient either in fact or law to be upheld by the court; to estimate the truth of each party's evidence; to determine the financial value of damages sustained by the complainant. In fact, all matters upon which the court felt unable to pronounce a verdict, went to the Master for his consideration. *Reports and Certificates* are the original reports made by the Master to the court, giving an opinion on the question submitted to him. The court thereupon gave a decision, which was based on the report, in favour of one of the parties, and his decree together with the preceding report were recorded in the entry books of Decrees and Orders.

Sometimes a matter was referred to arbitrators who were not Masters of the court. The awards given by them, and the agreements at which the parties arrived in various suits, are preserved in bundles from 1694² onwards. In many cases the awards were embodied in the reports subsequently made by the respective Masters.

¹ There were six Masters, each of which worked in conjunction with one of the Six Clerks and reported on his cases.

² Bundle 1 alone is of use for the period 1694-1714. These documents have no class number at present; application must be made for "Chancery Awards," giving the bundle number.

The *Reports and Certificates*, dating from 1544, are bound up in volumes, and arranged therein alphabetically under the plaintiff's name, term by term. From 1544 to 1606 they are not indexed. In order to find a report made before 1606 it is necessary to search the volumes themselves (for method of application see below). After that date the easiest method of ascertaining whether or not a report exists for a specific suit is as follows :

Turn to the list of *Reports and Certificates* (*Catalogue of Lists and Indexes*, Chancery section, p. 119 ; Press 15/55A) in which references to the indexes of these documents are given year by year, e.g.

Year	Index
1606-7	1878
1607-8	1879
1608-9	1880
1609-10	1881
1610-11	1882

The indexes themselves are arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name, term by term, beginning with Michaelmas. Index 1878 contains Michaelmas term 1606, Hilary term 1606/7, Easter and Trinity terms 1607. Similarly Index 1879 contains Michaelmas term 1607, Hilary term 1607/8, together with Easter and Trinity terms 1608. Indexes for the subsequent years are arranged in a similar way.

To obtain the reference to a report, first find the plaintiff's name and the date of the order referring the matter to a Master. Then search the appropriate indexes¹ beginning immediately after the date of the order. Reference is made to the number of the original report in its volume. Having obtained the reference, turn to the list of *Reports and Certificates* (*Chancery Class List*, p. 129 ; Press 24/26) which refers to the volumes of reports according to the date of their contents, e.g.

Volume No.	Date	Initial letter of Plaintiff's name
1	1544-1595	
2	1596, 7, 8	
3	1599-1600	
4	1601-1602	
5	1603-1604	A-Y
6	1605	A-Y
	
14	1609	H-Y
15	1610	B-K
16	1610	L-Y

¹ To apply for indexes to *Reports and Certificates* it is not necessary to give more than the index volume number, e.g. Index 1879.

Apply for the volume ¹ covering the necessary period and turn in this to the reference number given in the index.

The following is a practical example of finding a Chancery report :

Some time before May 12, 1608, Edward Kirkham and Thomas Kendall filed a bill of complaint against Henry Evans and Alexander Hawkins. By an order dated November 3, 1610, the court referred the matter to Sir John Tyndall, Master in Chancery. To ascertain whether or not his report exists it is necessary to search indexes for and after Michaelmas term 1610, *i.e.* Index 1882 *et seq.* As the initial letter of each plaintiff's name is the same, only suits indexed under K need to be examined. The original report on this case is indexed in Michaelmas term 1610 as being No. 15 in its volume. The volume containing this report is also numbered 15, so application should be made as follows : C31/15.

DEPOSITIONS

When the *Proceedings* were finished, *i.e.* when no more counter-replies were filed, the court commissioned certain persons to examine witnesses. Each counsel drew up a list of interrogatories to be administered to the witnesses for his own party, and submitted these interrogatories to the examiners who deleted any that did not meet with their approval. On an appointed day each set of interrogatories was administered by the examiners to the witnesses for whom they had been prepared, the depositions being recorded by a clerk as they were made. They were then sealed without being seen by the other party.

"Town" depositions were those taken at the Examiner's Office in London and recorded on *paper*. Country depositions were those taken by Commission.² That is, if the witnesses for a suit lived a great distance from London or were infirm the court sometimes commissioned their depositions to be taken near to their homes. The commissioners, usually attorneys who were not necessarily closely concerned with the case, conducted their examination at a place specified in the commission—usually the local inn or a private mansion. These depositions were recorded on *parchment* ; attached

¹ The class reference to *Reports and Certificates* is C31. Therefore to obtain, say, the volume for 1601-2, application must be made as follows : C31/4.

² Professor C. J. Sisson has pointed out an interesting description of an examination of witnesses by Commission (C24/395/35). It is unfortunately too long to be quoted here.

to them was the commission by which they were taken, and also an abstract of the Bill known as the "Dedimus Bill." These documents were then sent to London to the Examiner's Office.

When depositions for both sides had been taken the court ordered them to be "published," *i.e.* both sets of depositions were open to the inspection of either party, and the opposing counsels could thus arrange their speeches for the hearing having regard to the evidence for both sides. Sometimes the court decided for some reason or another that the depositions were not to be published. They have therefore remained sealed until the present day and are not open to inspection unless special authority is given.

INDEXES TO DEPOSITIONS

Unpublished : 1 Vol. MS. arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name. This must be applied for by ticket as Index 10779.

Published : (1) Country : 2 Vols. MS. Elizabeth-Charles I, arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name. (C21 and 22.)

<i>e.g.</i>		A Bundle I	
	No.	Plaintiff	Defendant
	I	Adams	<i>v.</i> Rumbal

The class reference number to country depositions is C21. Therefore to obtain the deposition of the suit Adams *v.* Rumbal apply as follows : C21/AI/1.¹

(2) Town :

(a) An Index in 1 Vol. MS. Henry VIII-Mary (C19), arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name.

(b) An Index in 7 Vols. MS.

			Index
Vol. I :	Elizabeth-George I (?)	A.B.	9115
Vol. II :	" "	C.D.	9116
Vol. III :	" "	E-H	9117
Vol. IV :	" "	H-L	9118
Vol. V :	" "	M-R	9119
Vol. VI :	" "	S-T	9120
Vol. VII :	" "	U-Z	9121

¹ That is, the class number, the initial letter of the plaintiff's name, bundle number, and finally the number of the deposition in the bundle.

(c) A reference list on p. 76 (*Chancery Class List* ; 26/24), e.g.

Bundle No.	Year	Term, etc.
126	18 & 19 Eliz.	Mich.
127	19 Eliz.	Hilary
128	19 Eliz.	Easter
129	19 Eliz.	Trin.
130	19 & 20 Eliz.	Mich.

As can be seen from the above example, reference is made by year and term to the bundles of depositions. If the date when a Bill was filed is known it is necessary to examine bundles containing depositions after that date. For example, if the case was begun in June 1577, bundles beginning with and following after No. 129 must be examined. It is unwise to abandon the search quickly as depositions were often not taken until long after the suit was begun. In the bundles themselves, the depositions are arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name, and numbered. This method of looking for depositions is far more satisfactory than that of using the Indexes mentioned above, as these are by no means complete.

(3) Six Clerks :

An Index in 6 Vols. MS., arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name.

Collins's Series (C55).

Hamilton's Series (C56).

Bridge's Series (C57).

Mitford's Series (C58).

Whittington's Series (C59).

Reynardson's Series (C60).

These refer to the depositions taken in connection with the Bills indexed in the Six Clerks Series, and are arranged on the same plan as the Indexes of Country depositions. They are applied for in the same way, having C22 as the class reference number.

Depositions are of great value to the student. The name of the witness, his residence, occupation and age are given at the beginning of his deposition, and his signature or mark is usually to be found at the end. The knowledge of a man's age and residence often points to parish registers which may yield the dates of his birth, marriage, death, and the birth of his children. The nature of his occupation may lead to further information, particularly if he was a member of one of the London Livery Companies. The depositions them-

selves often provide detailed information upon points of interest, and as they were recorded *verbatim* by the clerk, they often contain pieces of excellent descriptive prose.

AFFIDAVITS

Affidavits are the records of evidence made upon oath by various persons during the progress of a Chancery equity suit. It was usual for a messenger of the court to state in this way that he had delivered a writ of subpœna to the defendant. These affidavits made by messengers often prove of considerable value as the residence of the defendant is usually named, providing information which is useful when searching other records, such as parish registers or subsidy rolls. Both parties or any one having knowledge concerning a suit might be required by the court to record this knowledge. For example, if the strength of a complainant's case rested on his possession or non-possession of a certain deed, he was often required to make an affidavit stating whether he held the deed in question or not.

Affidavits relating to early Chancery suits are available in two forms :

(1) Original affidavits are preserved from 1611. They are arranged in bundles, alphabetically under the plaintiff's name, term by term. Each bundle contains the affidavits for one year. A reference list to them is given on p. 5, *Chancery Class List* ; Press 24/26, *e.g.*

Bundle	Date
1a	1611
1b	1615
2	1616
3	1617

The class reference number of these documents is C31. Therefore to ascertain whether an affidavit exists for a specific suit apply for the bundle containing documents after the date on which the Bill was filed. For example, if a case was begun in March, 1616, apply as follows : C31/2.

(2) The original affidavits were copied into books, presumably by a clerk of the court, and were known as the *Registers of Affidavits*. These have been preserved from 1615 and contain of course copies of affidavits of which the originals have been lost. A reference list to these registers is given on p. 11, *Chancery Class List* ; 24/26.

<i>e.g.</i>	No.	Date
	1	Prior to 1617 (<i>in a very bad condition</i>)
	2	1617 & 1618
	3	1620 to 1626
	4	1626 to 1629
	5	1629 & 1630 "A" ¹
	6	1629 & 1630 "B"
	7	1631

As there is no class reference number at present for these registers application must be made for them by name, giving the number of the register required, *e.g.* Chancery Registers of Affidavits, No. 4.

There is a MS. Index in 23 volumes (D32-54) to affidavits, beginning in 1611.

Vols. D32-39 deal with the period 1611-99.

Vols. D40-54 " " " 1700-1800.

These volumes are probably copied from an earlier Index, made when there was a greater number of original affidavits preserved. In the present Index an asterisk in the margin indicates that the affidavit referred to is extant. Copies of the entries not asterisked are to be found in the registers of affidavits. The Index is arranged alphabetically under the plaintiff's name, term by term, beginning with Hilary of each year, giving reference to the entry number in the affidavit register.

<i>e.g.</i>	No. of Affidavit	Hilary 1627 Plaintiff	Defendant
	6	Bradley	Musgrave
	24	Boindre & Wife	Wrottesley and others.
	40	Bidulfe	Willymott.

¹ The letters "A" and "B" indicate the same method of arrangement used in the Entry Books of Decrees and Orders after 1629, *i.e.* "A" contains letters A-K (being the initial letter of the plaintiff's name), "B" those from L to Z. The registers for 1631-1640 have both "A" and "B" books for each year bound together. After that date there is no division of the alphabet. The term headings in the Indexes for the registers of this period give references to the "A" and "B" books.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

ALPHONSO FERRABOSCO

IN *Marlowe and his Circle*, reviewed in *R.E.S.* for January 1931, Dr. Boas has something to say about Alphonso Ferrabosco the elder, who was a Court musician and spy in the pay of Queen Elizabeth. I find, in my transcripts of the Exchequer Account Books, a few mentions of him which may be of interest.

The Letters Patent granting him his annuity were signed at Gorhambury on October 6, 1567. The wording is :

Sciatis quod nos in Consideracione boni & acceptabilis servicij nobis per dilectum servientem nostrum Alphonsum de fferabosco antehac impenssum et impostum durante vita sua impendend de gratia nostra speciali ac ex certa sciencia & mero motu nostris dedimus & Concessimus ac per presentes pro nobis heredibus & Successoribus nostris damus & Concedimus eidem Alphonsio de fferabosco quandam annuitatem siue annualem redditum Centum librarum . . .

The payment is to commence from midsummer last past, and is to be continued :

durante vita sua si tam diu in hoc regno permanserit nisi cum licencia nostra heredum vell Successorum nostrorum ad aliquas partes extraneas interea ad aliquod tempus transire permissus fuit.¹

The *Tellers Views of Payments* only commence at Michaelmas 1569. In the volume for the year Mich. 1569–Mich. 1570 his assignee Joseph Lupo received the grant in four quarterly payments of £25. The next volume, 1570/71, is illegible through damp ; but from Mich. 1571 to Mich. 1576 Ferrabosco was paid his £100 a year by the Exchequer officials. From Mich. 1576 to Mich. 1582 he was paid £50 a year, except in 1579/80 when he only received £37 10s. The volume for 1582/83 is missing ; but from Mich. 1583 to Mich. 1588 Ferrabosco's name is entered in the ordinary way, but there is no record of any payments and no entry to explain why he was not paid. The volume for 1588/89 is missing, and by 1589/90 Ferrabosco's name has dropped out.² No doubt news of

¹ *Auditors Patent Book*, E. 403/2452, fol. 152 verso.

² E. 403/2259 to 2275. The volumes for 1572/73, 1574/75, and 1577/78 are, however, missing.

his death, which occurred at Bologna in August 1588, had by this time reached England.

The only occasion on which he himself received his money personally from the Exchequer officials, in so far as the volumes are complete, was on Lady Day 1572. On all other quarter days the payments were made to an assignee. These assignees were: Joseph Lupo (1569-1574), John Palmer (1575-1577), Gomer van Osterwick (1578-1582), and William Stubbes (1580-1582). Osterwick was a Court musician, whose salary was £24 a year; and Joseph Lupo is first mentioned as a "vyolon" in 1570 (Groves' *Dict. of Music*, iii, 250).

Another point of interest is the size of Ferrabosco's grant. In 1576, for example, there were altogether twelve court musicians whose salaries were: one at £50; one at £42 11s. 8d.; one at £36 10s.; five at £30 8s. 4d.; one at £24; and three at £18 5s. From this it would seem that Ferrabosco's large grant, while ostensibly given to him as a Court musician, was, in part at any rate, for his services as a spy. This would have helped, no doubt, to allay suspicion against him when he was engaged in espionage abroad. By 1576 he was back in England; and his grant seems to have been reduced to £50 a year, which is more in line with the general run of musicians' salaries. We do not know a great deal about Elizabethan secret service; and it may well be that other men were paid for their secret service activities in a similar sort of way.

B. M. WARD.

"NEW POEMS BY RANDOLPH"

MAY I be allowed to congratulate Mr. Cyrus L. Day on having brought to light so many new poems of Randolph,¹ and to express my hope that he will give us ere long an up-to-date edition of all Randolph's works? No more competent editor could be found.

p. 33. The lines "Dum Rex Paulinas" are found also in Rawl. Poet. MS. 26, fol. 11, and there too are ascribed to Hoskins. They are accompanied by an English version, ascribed to the same hand, "While at the altar of St. Paul."

p. 35, top. Mr. Day has printed a Distichon in Latin and English with the ascription "Tho: R:" and adds, "It seems probable . . . that

¹ See *R.E.S.* viii, 29-36.

both . . . versions . . . are by Randolph, but of course the signature, strictly speaking, applies only to the English version."

This is perhaps an overstatement. It is frequent in the University collections, for instance, where there is a group of poems by one author, to append his name only to the last poem of the group. Hazlitt omitted from his edition a Randolph poem contained in *Rex redux* (1633) and a string of poems on Cotton's death in *Parentalia* (1635) from ignorance of this rule.

p. 35, bot. "The next new piece . . . is a translation from . . . Claudian." The lines, "Jove saw the Heavens," etc., in the editions, closely translate Claudian's Epigram XVIII: the new lines are not a translation, but an original epigram on the same theme.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

"A MANUSCRIPT OF JAMES SHIRLEY'S *COURT SECRET*"

SINCE the publication of the article on this subject in the July issue an interesting piece of evidence has come to light. Harleian MS. 7650, the manuscript of the Duke of Newcastle's play, *The Country Captain*, in which Shirley is supposed to have had a share, proves on comparison to be in the hand of the scribe (hand A) of the *Court Secret* manuscript. *The Country Captain* was acted about 1639, and so the manuscript, which contains autograph corrections and certainly precedes the edition of 1649, was probably transcribed before November, 1642, when Newcastle took the field. This would support the assertion that the *Court Secret* manuscript belongs to 1642. The scribe is so far unidentified.

I may take this opportunity of acknowledging the kindness of Mr. C. H. Wilkinson, Librarian of Worcester College, in placing the manuscript of *The Court Secret* at my disposal and permitting me to print extracts.

R. G. HOWARTH.

AN UNCOLLECTED POEM BY WALLER

EDMUND WARCUPP's *Italy, in its original Glory, Ruine and Revival*, published in 1660, is a translation, with errors and omissions, and a few interpolations, from one of the editions of the Italian translation

of F. Schott's *Itinerarii Italice rerumque Romanarum libri tres*.¹ The additions are very slight, being mainly derived from John Raymond's *Mercurio Italico*. The passage here printed (pp. 35-36) has hitherto escaped notice. There can be no reason to doubt the authenticity of the poem: Waller is known to have been in Padua in 1646 not only from Evelyn's *Diary*, but also from his signature, with the date January 25, 1646, in a register of English travellers studying at or visiting the university there.²

Edmond
Waller
Esquire

Between the Church del *Santo* and that of *San Giustina*, lies the Physick Garden filled with simples, and planted in the year 1546. at the cost of the Students in Physick and Philosophy, to the end they might the more commodiously search into the nature & vertue of every Medicinal Herb: The chief care and custody of this Garden, is alwayes committed to some excellent Doctor in Physick, who Reads to the Students, the names and nature of every Simple; in the latter times *Melchior Guilandino*, *Giacomo Antonio Cortuso*, and *Prospero Alpino*, three excellent Persons underwent this charge, but at present tis in the hands of the learned *Giovanni Veslinghio*, or *Westlingius*, a Knight and Anatomy Reader in the University. A man allowed so great an esteem for his excellent knowledge, that he was become the Admiration of this Age, when I was in *Italy* [;] in honour of whom³ a worthy and Noble Person of our Nation, being casually at *Padoua*, at the proceeding of certain English, to the Degrees of Doctors, and having been an Auditor at some of his Lectures, composed these ensuing Verses upon the Anatomy.

¹ There is no satisfactory bibliography of this work, which was first published in 1600, and soon afterwards translated into Italian; it was frequently reprinted, especially in Italian, until the middle of the eighteenth century; some editions give as the author the better known Andreas Schott, the real author's brother. Warcup writes that he translated from the Italian, not the Latin. Loggan's frontispiece with the figure of Hercules is imitated from the similar frontispiece attached to some of the Padua editions; the earliest I have seen with it is dated 1654. There are articles on the two Schotts in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* and in the *National-Biographie*.

Warcup was a nephew of Speaker Lenthall; he acted as secretary to the Parliamentary Commissioners at the Treaty of Newport in 1648 (his journal of the proceedings there is now in the Bodleian Library, MS. Ballard 10839; see also T. Hearn, *Collections*, i, 21). He was serving under Monck in 1660, and was knighted by Charles II in 1684 (*A. Wood, Life and Times*, i, 311; *Fasti Oxonienses*, ii, 325).

² Printed by Horatio F. Brown in *Monografie storiche sullo Studio di Padova*, 1922. The register runs from 1618 to 1765.

³ Westlingius is also mentioned by Evelyn; there is a brief account of him—as Vesling—in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*.

A copy of Warcup's book, bearing the signature "Edmund Waller," was in Sotheby's sale, April 22, 1931, lot 856.

³ These words were misprinted in Warcup's text; the correct version, as here printed, is given in the list of errata.

Learned *Westlingius*, had we but the Art,
 To tell the Treasures of the nobler part ;
 And could the Soul's high powers describe as well,
 As you, the Palace where that Queen does dwell ;
 In her Anatomy my Muse might finde,
 Praises proportion'd to your knowing minde ;
 To whose great art and industry we owe
 That all the wonders of our Frame we know :
 For not the inventory, we alone
 Of every Nerve, Vein, Artery and Bone,
 Receive from thence, but are instructed too
 What the wise Maker has design'd them to :
 The great importance of the slendrest string,
 And use of every (seeming useless) thing :
 As if our first Creator you had seen,
 Or had of Counsel with *Prometheus* been,
 That all the Plagues which his rash Brother threw
 On wretched Man, might have their cure from you.

E. S. DE BEER.

A CONTINUATION OF JOHN GILPIN

AMONG a collection of ballads and broadsides in the British Museum is a poem bearing the title *A Second Holiday for John Gilpin, Or a Voyage to Vaux-hall, where, though he had better luck than before, he was far from being contented*. The sheet is slightly mutilated, the left-hand margin having been torn away by a hand which was not careful to spare the text. The date of publication is given as July 2, 1795, which is useful information ; but the name of the author is not stated, and, until very recently, could not be supplied from any external source.

A short time ago there emerged from the stock of a provincial bookseller a little volume ¹ which reveals the secret of the authorship as well as supplying the missing words, and may be found to have a wider interest. It consists of a miscellany of poems and pamphlets roughly bound together, and the first of the three title-pages reads as follows :

The Facetious Story of John Gilpin ; His Going Farther than he Intended, and Returning Home Safe at Last. By Mr. Cowper. And A Second Part, Containing an Account of The Disastrous Accidents which Befel His Wife, on Her Return to London. By Henry Lemoine. To Which is Added Gilpin's Second Holiday, Written by the late John Oakman. Printed for A. Lemoine, Bookseller, No. 1, White-Rose Court, Coleman-Street, and Sold by the Booksellers of London, Westminster, Edinburgh and Dublin. [Price Fourpence.]

¹ It has since been placed in the British Museum.

A comparison of *Gilpin's Second Holiday* with *A Second Holiday for John Gilpin* shows only slight variations, evidently due to revision. The principal difference consists in the fact that the poem in the British Museum begins and ends with the first and last stanzas of Cowper's *John Gilpin*, whereas the other version proceeds independently from its own beginning to its own conclusion. Here, then, is one little problem solved. The unknown poet was John Oakman, an author whose fame did not survive his own generation. The *Dictionary of National Biography* dismisses him in a few contemptuous lines, and the only work of his likely to be remembered, even by the title, is his *Life and Adventures of Benjamin Brass*, which seems to be a very feeble imitation of the manner of Richardson.

The preceding poem, or "Second Part" of *John Gilpin*, ascribed on the title-page to Henry Lemoine, seems to make its first and last appearance in this volume. On the ground of its authorship it deserves more attention than Oakman's performance, for Lemoine, if not a genius, was a man of such considerable talent, and so typical of the versatile bookseller of the eighteenth century, that his work excites more curiosity than the modern reader can easily satisfy. Such records of his career as have come down to us resolve themselves into a collection of anecdotes copied from one periodical into another. It is not likely that any of the stories contains more than a grain of truth, for Lemoine's personality was of the kind upon which anecdotes grow of themselves. In his portrait, given as the frontispiece to Volume V of Granger's *Wonderful Museum*, we may read the signs of lonely abstraction as clearly as the Host read them on the face of Chaucer, and a more discerning eye than that of the Host will detect evidence also of a quiet humour. The inscription below is in these words, the very stuff of which anecdotes are made: "Henry Lemoine, the Literary and Pedestrian Bookseller and Author, a well-known Eccentric Character of the City of London."

To the gleanings of information gathered by the *Dictionary of National Biography* a small addition may be made which is relevant to the subject of these notes. It may be stated with confidence that Lemoine and Oakman were personally acquainted for the greater part of their lives. The contemporary account of Lemoine in Granger's *Wonderful Museum* mentions John Oakman as one of the friends of his youth who helped him to indulge his taste for feasting and revelry; and as Lemoine and Oakman were kindred spirits, though unequal in talent, an intimacy so formed would be likely to prosper. Stronger

evidence is afforded by the obituary notice of Oakman in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December 1793. The article bears the signature, "Henry Lemoine," and, brief as it is, displays that easy mastery of fact and circumstance which is the natural product of a continuous friendship. This conclusion leads to another. The kind of Bohemian intimacy which we are led to imagine would be likely at times to take the form of literary collaboration. It is probable, therefore, that the continuation of *John Gilpin* was undertaken as a joint enterprise upon a pre-arranged plan; and this probability is strengthened by some slight internal evidence. Lemoine's contribution closes with the unexpected statement that Gilpin, in spite of his misadventures,

Only wished to make once more
Another holiday.

This intimation is plainly calculated to prepare the reader's mind for a sequel; and Oakman, in supplying the sequel, is careful to conclude by echoing the words of his partner or predecessor:

But Gilpin thought he ne'er would have
Another holiday.

It thus becomes evident that the two additions were intended, together with Cowper's original, to form an organic whole, and to appear in print together; and from this it follows that the volume in which they do so appear is more authoritative than the copy of *A Second Holiday for John Gilpin* in the British Museum. The latter must have been seen to be lacking in artistic finish when presented as an independent composition; and this would account for the action of the publisher in affixing the first and last stanzas of the original *John Gilpin* at the beginning and end. Some such framework was needed to support a structure not designed by its author to stand alone.

While neither of the supplementary poems will bear comparison with the authentic *John Gilpin*, it is not a very hazardous exercise in criticism to say that Lemoine's effort is superior to Oakman's. Lemoine, by placing Mrs. Gilpin in the forefront of his scheme, spares himself the necessity to take impertinent liberties with Cowper's creation; Oakman is compelled by the nature of his attempt to meddle with the wand of the magician, and is confounded by his rashness. Mrs. Gilpin's adventures, as Lemoine imagines them, arise in a certain natural sequence, and are not in

themselves incredible. Having despatched the post-boy on the errand which we remember, she proposes to have dinner rather than waste the fare provided. The children heartily assent; but while the feast is in progress Gilpin is seen approaching on his return journey. The state of mind which prompts Mrs. Gilpin's next action, when she finds that her cries are ineffectual, is not wholly unworthy of her original character :

Her Heart again began to beat,
And Tears bedimm'd her Eye ;
She call'd the Bill, resolved soon,
She after him would fly.

On receiving the bill, however, she is so scandalised at the amount of the charge that her habit of cautious economy re-asserts itself, and she decides to pack up and take with her the unconsumed remnants of the feast. This causes a delay; and when at last she sets out on her pursuit, feeling that valuable time has been lost, she drives with more haste than judgment, and the coach is upset. In despair of righting the coach she attempts to walk, having in the meantime heard a rumour, which she is sensible enough to disbelieve, that Gilpin has met with a fatal accident. Her extreme corpulence, as the poet explains with evident gusto, unfits her for the exercise of walking, and she is on the point of collapse when the scene is transformed by the unexpected appearance of her husband.

For soon as he had reach'd Cheapside,
And from his Horse got down,
He with another Hat and Wig
Had sallied out of Town.

After this it does not take the poet long to banish what remains of her misfortunes.

Oakman's contribution may be still more briefly summarised. Some time after his first adventure Gilpin, grown incredibly stupid and morose, yields to the persuasion of his wife and daughters to take a second holiday, and they decide to go by water to Vauxhall. Of the series of trifling irritations which follows, the first is the only one which has any appearance of naturalness or probability. Gilpin is recognised by some wags in a neighbouring boat, who salute him ironically as the hero of the ride to Edmonton, and dash the water in his face. He then loses his hat in the river, but recovers it so easily that the incident is promptly forgotten. He is annoyed at being charged four shillings for admission to the gardens. He accidentally knocks a bottle of champagne from the hand of a passing waiter,

after which he spoils his enjoyment of the feast by brooding over the cost. The conclusion, in which

He eat and grumbled all the while,
He grumbled, yet he paid,

extinguishes any recollection of the true Gilpin which the reader may retain. There is competent mastery of rhyme and accent, but no power of invention and no real humour.

Without returning to the companion poem, it may be permissible to point out an error in the account of Lemoine in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which is calculated to injure his reputation. The writer says: "Under the pseudonym of 'Allan Macleod' he subsequently attacked Lackington in his ironical 'Lackington's 'Confessions' rendered into Narrative,' London, 1804." The truth is that Allan Macleod was a real person, and not one with whom an inoffensive man of letters would wish to be identified. The *Gentleman's Magazine* describes him as "proprietor and editor of the 'London Albion Journal,'" and records his death in 1805, whereas Lemoine lived till 1812. The *D.N.B.* itself gives this information in the appropriate place, and proceeds: "Macleod published a number of political and other pamphlets, all of which are couched in an offensive and conceited style." Among the products of this offensive and conceited style *Lackington's 'Confessions' rendered into Narrative* is mentioned correctly by name. The error of attributing this worthless tract to Lemoine has found its way into the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. In that work, if the Index is correct, the name of Lemoine occurs only once. Following the reference to Volume XI, p. 472, we find him credited with three works on the general subject of "Book Production and Distribution," of which *Lackington's 'Confessions' rendered into Narrative* is the third. Possibly the origin of this apparent confusion is the following cryptic statement in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (vol. 82, p. 673), occurring in the obituary notice of Lemoine: "Mr. Lemoine, some time after that eccentric bookseller [Lackington] had published what he termed his own Life, published another, which has been called the *real* Life of Lackington." What this "*real* Life of Lackington" may have been is beyond the present writer's power of conjecture, as a search for any volume answering the description was unsuccessful.

Another small problem which this article must leave unsolved is presented by the title-page transcribed above. What was the

connection, if any, between the Henry Lemoine whom we know and "A. Lemoine," the publisher? We cannot suppose them to be identical even if we allow the possibility of a printer's error in the initial, for Henry Lemoine never lived at White Rose Court. From 1781 to 1795 he was in business as a bookseller in Bishopsgate Churchyard, and from the latter year until a few months before his death in 1812 he was a lonely wanderer, having no permanent home. It was this long experience of friendless poverty which qualified him for the leading place among the eccentric characters of the City of London.

P. L. CARVER.

SOUTHEY'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE *FOREIGN* *REVIEW*

SOME time since I called attention to the omissions and mistakes made by the Reverend C. Cuthbert Southey in printing one of his father's letters.¹ Another instance of the unreliability of his editorial work has recently come to my notice. In an appendix to the final volume of *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey* he gives a very inaccurate and incomplete list of his father's works, including his contributions to periodicals, which ends with three titles from the *Foreign Quarterly Review*: "Barantes' History of the Dukes of Burgundy, On the Spanish Moors, Life of Ignatius Loyola." The second of these is clearly the article with which the first number of the *Review* opens, but the first and third elude the most careful research through the remaining volumes. By the aid of J. W. Warter's *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*—a much better piece of work in every way—it becomes clear that both C. C. Southey and Warter confused two periodicals which the poet himself clearly distinguished: the *Foreign Quarterly Review* and the *Foreign Review*.² To the first Southey seems to have contributed but one article, that in the opening number. In the second he printed at least four: on Barante's *Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne* (i, 1828, 1-44, see Warter, iv, 72, 84), on Navarrete's *Coleccion de los*

¹ "A Project of Wordsworth's," *R.E.S.*, v (July 1929), 320-22.

² The confusion is due in part to Southey's letter of December 6, 1827, C. W. W. Wynn (Warter, iv, 72), in which he says he is "finishing a paper upon M. de Barante's 'History' . . . for the rival journal," that is, the *F.Q.R.*; yet the article actually appeared in the *F.R.*

Viages (i, 1828, 576-626, see Warter, iv, 105), on Conde's *Historia de la Dominacion de los Arabes en España* and Carvajal's *Historia del Rebelion y Castigo de los Moriscos* (iii, 1829, 1-56, see Warter, iv, 119, 120), and on Bouhour's *La Vie de Saint Ignace* (v, 1830, 271-324, see Warter, iv, 163). The matter is still further obscured by the omission of the last article from the references to the *Foreign Review* in Warter's index, and by the fact that Southey based two articles on Conde's *Historia* (*F.Q.R.* i, 1-60 and *F.R.* iii, 1-56), and that Warter, confusing the two magazines, makes him refer to the second article (iv, 58 n.) when he is in fact speaking of the first, which appeared a year and a half earlier.

What is more serious, however, is the doubt these mistakes cast on the dependability of Cuthbert Southey's entire list of his father's contributions to periodicals. This, so far as I know, is the only printed bibliography of a large and influential part of Southey's work, and as the articles themselves have never been gathered together it is desirable that we should at least be sure of what they are.

RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS.

A CANCEL IN THE POLITICAL MISCELLANIES

In my copy of the *Political Miscellanies* (178[?]), one of the *Rolliad* satires, pp. 135-36 exist in two states, the first of which is a cancel. The text of the first page 135 stops at the fourteenth line, below which is printed "End of the first part"; the reverse of the sheet is devoted to advertisements of books. The second page 135 has been entirely reset, the words which had required fourteen lines now fill but thirteen; "End of the first part" disappears, and in its place we find the "Journal of the Right Hon. Henry Dundas." This "Journal" extends to page 148 when it is followed by "Incantation, for Raising a Phantom" (pp. 148-49) and "Translations of Lord Belgrave's Memorable Quotation" (pp. 150-54), after which comes the word "Finis." As the "Journal" is supposed to run from October 1787 to March 14, 1788, it was presumably printed after the appearance of the *Political Miscellanies*, one of which is dated "June 20, 1786," and of which a complete edition (perhaps not the first) was printed in 1787. My copy, which begins with signature B, lacks a title-page, but, judging from the advertisements on the original

page [136], it appeared in 1786 or 1787. As the volume is the least interesting of the entire *Rolliad* group, it may not have sold well, and the lively "Journal of Henry Dundas" together with the two poems may have been added to the remaining copies in order to secure more purchasers. At least something of the kind must lie behind the two states in which pp. 135-36 occur.¹

RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *THE DRINKING ACADEMY*

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

DEAR SIR,

The play was published in 1930 as "by Thomas Randolph," the preface being signed by Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum and Professor Hyder E. Rollins, the latter of whom kindly sent me a copy. I reviewed the edition in *R.E.S.*, vi, 476-483, and expressed the view to which I had then been driven, that the play was not by Randolph, but was put together after his death by some one acquainted with his published works. I suggested that the evidence pointed to Robert Baron as the man in question.

As the editors insisted that the MS. which they had followed was an "author's" MS., I wrote:

"If the play, as now maintained, is in Randolph's hand, one would expect to find some correspondence in the writing with the almost contemporary signatures of Randolph in the University and Trinity College admission books." I complained that this great opportunity of determining if the handwriting of the MS. was indeed Randolph's had been lost, the editors being content to say: "Hazlitt gives facsimiles, from unspecified sources, of two signatures, which may or may not be genuine autographs."

In answer to my review, Professor Hyder Rollins published a long article in *P.M.L.A.* xlv, 786-801. It was much occupied, however, with disproving Baron's authorship of the play and showing that my review was at variance with some earlier opinions of mine

¹ In the 1790 edition, the first half of p. 135 is the same as in the first p. 135 in my copy, but there is no "End of the first part," and Dundas's "Journal" begins on p. 136.

on the authorship of the play. It met the point I have put above only at second-hand :

"Trinity College, the reviewer insists, has three signatures, with an additional formula, all in Randolph's hand," "The dates and authenticity of these signed statements are unimpeachable." Dr. Tannenbaum informs me, however, that "the alleged Randolph writings¹ are entries made by the clerks, the same clerks who made most of the other entries on the pages in which Randolph's name occurs." I do not pretend to be an authority on handwriting and I leave the subject to be discussed by Dr. Tannenbaum (pp. 798-9).

Professor Rollins' article demanded some reply, and I trusted to the courtesy of the Editor of *P.M.L.A.* to admit a short note from me in which I tried to fix attention on the point, which Professor Rollins seemed to pass over somewhat lightly, "Is there any evidence that *The Drinking Academy* was the work of Randolph?"

Mr. Percy Long, the editor, however, returned me my note on the ground that it did not deal with the whole of Professor Rollins' article and "would be looked upon here as an evasion of the issue" [what the issue is, was not specified], and I should therefore be glad if you would allow it to appear in *R.E.S.* I had written as follows :

THOMAS RANDOLPH AND *THE DRINKING ACADEMY*

Readers of Professor Hyder E. Rollins' paper in *P.M.L.A.* xlv, pp. 786-801, may very likely in the multitude of points raised, miss the main point of my case against Randolph's authorship of the play. May I put it as briefly as possible?

The editors argue that the MS. of the play is in the handwriting of its author and the author is (on other grounds) stated to be Randolph. But, if so, as I said, the handwriting must agree with Randolph's, as shown in five autographs preserved at Cambridge.

Randolph at Cambridge, like every other Cambridge man, was a member of a college and a member of the University. In the former character he became at different dates, Scholar, Minor Fellow and Major Fellow. Like everyone else in such a position, on each occasion he had to sign his name in a book, such books being thereafter preserved at Trinity. As a member of the University, he became B.A. and later M.A., and on each occasion

¹ Dr. Tannenbaum seems only to have been acquainted with those at Trinity. Facsimiles of Randolph's five autographs will be found in Dr. Greg's forthcoming third part of *English Literary Autographs, 1550-1650*.—G.C.M.S.

signed his name in a book, thereafter preserved in the University Registry. Photographs of these five signatures, each occurring among a crowd of others, show the same hand in all and that hand not the hand of the author of *The Drinking Academy*. Until this is refuted, then, on the editors' own showing *The Drinking Academy* was not written by Randolph.

As for the theory that the entries were made by clerks, it is ridiculous to anyone who sees a page in which the signatures occur, every different name in its own hand. Had the college such a multitude of clerks, and had these college clerks access to the books of the University?

Randolph being dismissed from the case, the question left is 'Who wrote *The Drinking Academy*?' In spite of Professor Rollins' paper, I think Baron is a likely candidate. But this is a mere suggestion and I shall be glad if he can make a better one."

November 30, 1931

I ought perhaps to have noticed the following interesting statement in Professor Rollins' article:

Even granting that the play is not a holograph, my arguments would remain completely unaffected. Other manuscript works known to be Randolph's are not in his own handwriting. *P.L.M.A.*, xlvi, p. 799.

Certainly. But is it not surprising that Professor Rollins, so severe a critic of any change of view, after making himself jointly responsible for the edition of *The Drinking Academy* of 1930, the introduction to which strongly insisted that the MS. was in its author's handwriting, should now apparently be willing to abandon this contention, if by that means alone Randolph's authorship can be maintained? Dr. Tannenbaum has not yet published the results of his examination of the Cambridge signatures. It may be that he will stick honestly to the view expressed before, that *The Drinking Academy* is an author's MS., and in order to escape an absurd position be driven to the conclusion that the author cannot be Randolph. It is clear that the two editors should have examined their ground a little more carefully before enouncing in their edition views which seem mutually irreconcilable.

Yours faithfully,

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

REVIEWS

The English Works of Sir Thomas More. In seven volumes.

Reproduced in black letter facsimile from the only previous edition, edited by William Rastell in 1557. Now re-edited, with a version in modern spelling, by W. E. CAMPBELL. With historical introduction, and with philological notes, collations and appendices by A. W. Reed, M.A., D.Lit., and R. W. Chambers, M.A., D.Lit., F.B.A. Vol. I, *The Early Poems*, *Pico della Mirandola*, *Richard III*, *The Four Last Things*. Eyre and Spottiswoode, Ltd. 1931. Pp. xvi+511. Price 42s. net.

MR. CAMPBELL has done well in persuading Professor R. W. Chambers and Professor A. W. Reed to help him in his courageous enterprise—for the publication of the whole of More's English Works in black letter facsimile with a modern version is a courageous enterprise in these days, and Mr. Campbell deserves our warmest thanks for thus making available much of More that has hitherto been difficult of access. The 1557 edition is a formidable folio in double-columns and not easily come by except in great libraries, so that it is a great boon to be able to read in this new edition the beautifully reproduced facsimile pages at our leisure and in our own studies.

That, however, is but one of our debts to Mr. Campbell. He has enlisted invaluable collaborators: Dr. Reed here gives us an introduction to William Rastell and More's English Works, together with some pages of admirable philological and explanatory notes, while Dr. Chambers contributes some twenty pages on the authorship of *Richard III*, and Mr. Doyle-Davidson has made an elaborate and fascinating study of the text and prints his summary of conclusions as well as his full collations of the 1557 text with other early texts. Finally, there follows a modernised version of the black letter text, the work of the Editor, assisted by Mr. Doyle-Davidson. In an earlier issue of this Review (*R.E.S.*, Vol. 4, p. 352) Dr. McKerrow dealt with some of the difficulties of modernisation, and Mr. Campbell has certainly done a great deal to overcome them in this volume. Modernisation will always be a vexed question and some will doubt

the wisdom of bothering so much about those who will not make the necessary effort to read the original, but this apart, the modernisation is well done, although I think more use might well have been made of Dr. Reed's explanations and notes, and certainly there should be some easy means of identification (by indication in the margin or text) of the page and section references to the black letter. All the references by Dr. Reed and Dr. Chambers are solely to the black letter, and at present most of these are almost useless to the reader of the modernised version.

For the rest there can be little but praise. Dr. Chambers' essay on the authorship of *The History of Richard III*, strengthened as it is by Dr. Reed's work, seems to settle the question for ever. It is one of those careful, exact, patient pieces of work we have learnt to expect from Dr. Chambers, and we are carried from point to point in an eager assent to his conclusion that More was the author of *The History of Richard III*. Dr. Reed's Introduction on Rastell and More's English Works marshals the important facts so that gradually our understanding of the writings of More is clarified and deepened, and aided by his suggestions and explanations we are enabled for the first time to see our way forward into the thicket of More's writings. It is greatly to be hoped that these two scholars will continue thus to elucidate the successive portions of More's work as it appears.

Literary students will find much of great interest in studying this volume, but two points seem specially worth noting. First, the economy and control More shows in his poem on the death of Elizabeth, wife of Henry VII, in 1503.

Where are our Castels, now where are our Towers,
Goodly Rychmonde sone art thou gone from me,
At Westminster that costly worke of yours,
Myne owne dere lorde now shall I neuer see.
Almighty god vouchsafe to graunt that ye,
For you and your children well may edefy.
My palyce bylded is, and lo now here I ly.

Why did More never repeat verses such as this and what accident was it that led to a poem with this movement and cadence being written in this barren poetical season? For More never repeats this; his later versification, when he is translating Pico della Mirandola's prose, is wretched enough, and even in the *Book of Fortune* there are evident signs despite some good verses that his genuine poetic qualities are waning.

Secondly, parts of *The History of Richard III* and more especially *The Four Last Things* show More's powers as a writer of English prose. In a recent number of this Review (*R.E.S.*, Vol. 7, p. 467) I questioned the high place given to More for his prose in the *Apology*, but if More had always written as he does in this unfinished tractate my case would have been much weakened. For here More gives full play to his powers; writing apparently for his family he feels no restraint, and pours forth a splendid torrent of language, while illustrations of the most forcible, realistic, homely and learned nature jostle one another for utterance. One brief example must suffice:

Haue ye not ere this in a sore sicknes felt it very grieuous to haue folk babble to you, and namely suche thynges as ye shold make aunswere to, whan it was a pain to speake? Thinke ye not now that it will be a gentle pleasure, whan we lye dying, al our body in pain, al our mind in trouble, our soul in sorow, our hearte al in drede, while our life walketh awaiward, while our death draweth toward, while ye deuil is busy about us, while we lack stomak & strength to beare any one so manifold heynous troubles, wil it not be as I was about to say, a pleasant thing, to see before thine eyen, & heare at thine eare, a rabble of fleshly frendes, or rather of flesh flies, skyping about thy bed & thy sicke body, like rauens about thy corps now almost carreyne, cryinge to thee on euery side, what shall I haue what shall I haue. Than shal come thy children & crye for theyr partes. Than shal come thy swete wyfe, & where in thyne heale happelye shee spake thee not one swete worde in sixe wekes, now shal she call thee swete husband & wepe with much woorke & ask the what shal she haue. Than shall thyne executours aske for the kayes, and aske what money is owyng thee, aske what substance thou hast and aske where they money lyeth. And whyle thou lvest in that case their wordes shal be so tedious, that thou wilt wyshe all that they aske for upon a red fyre, so thou mightest lye one half houre in rest.

H. S. BENNETT.

The Course of English Classicism. Hogarth Lectures No. 12. By **SHERARD VINES**. The Hogarth Press. 1930. Pp. 160. 3s. 6d. net.

MR. VINES has written a very stimulating and provocative book. His purpose is to trace the course (not a course, as the page headings have it) of English classicism, the growth of classical principles, of the ideas of order, universality, and humanity in British art from their beginnings under the Tudors. Classic decorum had, however, a long fight before its law and order could be imposed; "what the

humanists had sown under Henry VIII was no more than sprouting under Elizabeth." But the "will to classicism" grew steadily in vigour, so that, before the close of the sixteenth century, England was becoming fairly impregnated by the new humanities, and Seneca and the Greek novelists were more widely known. Mr. Vines proceeds to describe the influence of Senecan tragedy, the rise of English æsthetic with Ascham, Bacon, and Hobbes, and the attempts to select and order Nature for the purpose of art, until the ideal of "Nature Methodised," the creed of Rapin and Dufresnoy, was formulated and prevailed, or was at least held, well into the nineteenth century. In the chapter on "The Age of Baroque and the Grand Manner," the literature of the period is illumined by a discussion of the qualities of the art of Thornhill, Vanbrugh, Wren, Purcell and others. "*Quidlibet audendi* is a motto of the Baroque. . . . Dryden's own work in drama, non-dramatic poesy, and prose, was copious and instinct with a lively motion; the robustness, the bold modern gestures that were yet reminiscent of the ancients, which distinguish him are also distinctive of the Baroque." Then follows an account of the "Age of Politeness and Good Sense," with Pope "the pediment of the façade that had been building laboriously," and finally a chapter on Georgian Developments.

There are, in the course of the survey many provoking remarks where Mr. Vines calls the Romantics and the disciples of the Gothic to stand and deliver the reasons for their preferences. "Davenant . . . produced *Gondibert* which, popular prejudice or no, compares very favourably with the hebetudes of *The Life and Death of Jason*; his prose style . . . exhibits virility and politeness in a combination that renders ridiculous the rough Gothic fortissimo of a Ruskin." Or again, "the calm grandeur of Denham's descriptive couplets [in *Cooper's Hill*] compares well with Tennysonian antics in *The Daisy* or *The Voyage of Maeldune*." Unlike Alastor, Mr. Vines' "fearless steps" are not to be "lured by the wide waste and tangled wilderness"; he prefers the firm, if circumscribed, tessellated pavement. After quoting lines from Stephen Duck's *Richmond Park* (1731) he says, "The technique is that of a mechanical tessellation, but the pseudo-Roman pavement so made is firm to stand on; it will not let us down; whereas, in the age of wonder every footstep is jeopardised. If Shelley touches the highest, he sinks all the deeper below water-level."

Such pronouncements animate a lecture and have, therefore,

their rightful place in this study, which is one of the Hogarth Lectures in Literature. If we have accepted Mr. Vines' less vituperative but more penetrating and lasting criticisms unmoved, we are roused at last to defend our opinions and compelled, it may be, to reform some of our calloused opinions of Augustan literature and art.

G. N. G.

Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses.

By W. W. GREG. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1931.
Vol. I, Commentary. Pp. xiii+378; Vol. II, Reproductions and Transcripts. £4 4s.

A BOOK from the average scholar is a book, but a book from Dr. Greg is an event. The reason is obvious: always the outcome of a rare erudition and marked by immense painstaking, cautious procedure and penetrative skill, it not alone proves valuable as a work of reference but is inspirational. Heavy as is the debt of Elizabethan scholarship to Dr. Greg, it has been materially increased by this, the latest result of a lifelong devotion to its service. In it we have an elaborate and what cannot fail to prove a procreative discussion of early players' parts, stage plots, prompt books and other manuscript plays. With some of the ground little traversed, to enter upon such a task requires confidence in one's knowledge, and Dr. Greg is, on the whole, justified in his possession of that confidence. If, after wrestling with a host of difficulties, he fails to emerge wholly scatheless, we must at least register to his credit a majority of the falls.

The basic element of the work is a large volume of exact facsimiles representative of each section, with type reproductions usefully placed on the opposite pages. In the minutely-detailed commentary that accompanies it, it is, happily, the riper and richer Greg that is revealed, for such is his honesty of purpose that he never hesitates to point out and correct the errors into which the earlier Greg had occasionally fallen. Of the three kinds of documents discussed, actors' parts, because making little beyond mere antiquarian appeal, are the least important. What, however, the book establishes is that as early as the close of the fourteenth century actors' parts in the miracle plays were written on strips of vellum which were fastened together at the ends and rolled. Out of this practice there apparently emerged a convention which was followed for long by the players

of secular drama. Rolled parts written on strips of foolscap were in vogue in Shakespeare's day,¹ but only one has come down to us, Alleyn's part of Orlando, which Dr. Greg fully reproduces. He expresses himself as at a loss to determine when this practice ceased, but theatrical antiquaries know that it was not followed in the eighteenth century, and the probabilities are that it fell into desuetude at the Restoration. Whatever the Elizabethan usage, the later players seem to have written out their own parts. Preserved in the Theatrical Museum in the Widener Library at Harvard are two small octavo notebooks containing several of Charles Macklin's parts, with cues and other details, in his own autograph. One of these—that of Scrub in *The Beaux' Stratagem*—was transcribed in 1738. I recall also that several years ago Garrick's part of Lovemore in *The Way to Keep Him*, written out by himself and preserved in its original stitched wrappers, figured in a second-hand dealer's catalogue.

In studying Dr. Greg's book for purposes of this review, an idea struck me that seems worth embodying here. It would appear that the original method of transcribing and preserving actors' parts led to a curious system of measuring their length, a system which remained in vogue until well within living memory. Until the disruption of the venerable stock (or repertory) principle in the late 'seventies, it was usual for the actor to speak of his part as consisting of so many "lengths," a length then comprising, on the somewhat earlier testimony of George Vandenhoff, forty lines. The measure, however, seems to have varied from time to time, and probably suffered a gradual diminishment. Writing in his *Memoirs* in 1790, Tate Wilkinson informs us that "each length should be forty-four lines, including the cues," meaning, as I take it, forty-four lines, as well as the cues. We have no means of determining how long then the technicality had been in use, but the fact that Macklin's part of Lissardo in *The Wonder*, now at Harvard, is marked "7 and $\frac{1}{2}$ Lths" serves to show that it dates at least from the early eighteenth century.

It seems to me not unlikely that it dated from Elizabethan times, and was due to the practice of writing the part out on strips of equal size. A reckoning would be determined from the average number of lines in a series of strips. In Alleyn's part of Orlando, the preserved strips vary from forty-nine to fifty-two lines, with an

¹ A similar practice was undoubtedly in vogue in France about the same period. Not otherwise can one account for the fact that, for centuries past, an actor's part in a French play has been commonly known as his *rôle*.

average of fifty, and it may be that originally fifty lines constituted "a length."

The stage history and customs which lie embedded in the old plots form a study Dr. Greg has long made his own, much to the increase of our knowledge, and his maturer discussion of the intricacies and perplexities presented by the plots is therefore of extreme value. Since he expresses himself as unaware of any contemporary reference to these tiring-house aids, I take leave to point out that in the drama of the time there are at least two such allusions, one in *Antonio's Revenge*, iv, 3, 1582-1584, and a later one in Day's *Humour out of Breath*, iv, 2.

A line of future inquiry is suggested by Dr. Greg's conclusion (p. 97) that, although the sixteenth-century plots more or less indicate the observance of act-intervals, there were, seemingly, no act-divisions in the prompt books from which their details were extracted. This would point to a general custom of writing plays in scenes only, leaving the divisions to be made, according to the exigencies, in the playhouse. Such a method would not be without its conveniences, since once the playwright had found that a certain number of sheets of his writing represented the maximum length (or duration) of a play, he could go right ahead without worrying over matters of construction. If followed to any extent, it might be taken as accounting for the fact that Elizabethan acts are purely arbitrary divisions, and seldom predicated by any dramaturgic necessity. Failing this theory, it is difficult to understand why an act-division comes sometimes in the middle of a scene, as in *All's Lost by Lust* and *Brennoralt*. But writing in scenes only can at no time have been an exclusive rule. The system would have applied to plays of single authorship alone, and even then not wholly. It is fairly well assured that plays written in collaboration were shaped to a scenario, and had perforce to be devised in acts.

It is probably due as much to his wariness as to his acumen that Dr. Greg (unlike most scholars) when he guesses often guesses correctly. Thus, at p. 142, he surmises, very astutely, that the mutes mentioned in the plots were the stage attendants. By a coincidence, an article of mine on "Shakespeare's Supers" was published in *The New Statesman and Nation* of February 28, 1931, while his book was in the press, in which it was demonstrated that from Shakespeare's day to Sheridan's the technical term for a super was a mute.

The question, at what period of the action the money-takers of the house, otherwise the "gatherers," could be pressed into stage service as auxiliaries, mooted by Dr. Greg on p. 125, can, I think, be fairly well answered. In musing over it, I have arrived at, if not a series of wholly new facts, at least a new and not implausible theory. It is known that at the Hope Theatre in 1614 there were about nineteen attendants who were denominated as gatherers, and twenty-one at the Red Bull in the year following. Purely as cash-receivers either number was greatly in excess of the requirements; for that purpose ten would have been a sufficiency. There is good reason to suppose that about half the number at either house were guards deputed to save the money-takers from assault and prevent rowdies from gaining free entry. Guards were all the more necessary because a proportion of the gatherers (gradually increasing as the years went on) were women. Furthermore, in postulating guards as distinctive from gatherers, one does not wholly beg the question. Here is the proof. In August 1660 Sir Henry Herbert, as the result of a petition to the King made by John Rogers, an old maimed soldier, issued an order commanding the masters of all the playhouses to give Rogers "the same weekly allowance from you and every one of you, for himselfe and his men, for Guarding your playhouses from all Molestations and Injuries, which you formerly did or doe allow or pay to other persons for the saime or such like seruices" (J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp. 83-84).

For a cogent reason, presently to be unfolded, the gatherers were compelled to desert their stands at the end of the second act of the play and betake themselves to the tiring house, leaving the guards to protect the doors. This precaution was still necessary because there was interior communication from the yard to the Gentlemen's Rooms and the galleries, and once the doors were left free the groundlings would have invaded the more comfortable parts of the house. Of this desertion on the part of the gatherers we have an inkling in Braithwait's *Whimsies* (1631), where, in describing the habits of rufflers, he writes:

To a play they wil hazard to go, though with never a rag of money: where, after the second act, when the door is weakly guarded, they will make forcible entrie; a knock with a cudgel as the worst; whereat though they grumble, they rest pacified upon their admittance. Forthwith by violent assault and ascent, they aspire to the two-pennie roome, where being furnished with tinder, match, and a portion of decayed Barmoodas, they smoak it most terribly, etc.

The secret of the departure of the gatherers to the tiring house before the play was half over is that the takings had to be reckoned up and divided for allotment before the performance ceased, so that each actor-sharer's dividend could be placed on "the sharing board" and pocketed by him before he went home.¹ Once having surrendered up their money-boxes to the treasurer, the gatherers were at liberty to serve on the stage as supers, say, about the middle of the third act.

Just one more comment, and then I must pass on regretfully from the fascinations of the plots. At p. 66, Dr. Greg puts, to my mind, an untenable gloss on Henslowe's entry relative to the "Tensell for bornes womones gowne." He forgets, by some curious slip of memory, that elderly women's parts were played in Elizabethan times (as they were on the French stage long after actresses had begun to be regularly employed) by men. Naturally, we have little proof of this, since so few full casts have come down to us, but I can recall at least one instance. Robert Pallant the elder played Cariola, the waiting maid, an important role, in the original production of *The Duchess of Malfi* in 1613.² But I take it that for most investigators the point will not require much proving. Does any one believe that the Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet* could possibly have been sustained by a boy?

Apparently, from the tenour of his comment, Dr. Greg seems to think that the evidence proving the use elliptically of "act" in the sense of act-time or act-interval is scarce, but the facts are otherwise. Marston even goes the length of using it textually in *What You Will*. At the end of Act II, we find Quadratus saying:

That's all my prayers exact:
So ends our chat; sound music for the act.

We also get the phrase, "whilst the Act is playing" (meaning the music in the interval) in both *The Malcontent* (direction at the opening of Act II) and *The Fatal Dowry* (end of the second act). For proof of its survival at the Restoration, see *Covent Garden Drollery*, edit. Summers, 1927, p. 20, where, in "A Lampoon on the Green-

¹ For daily payment, see *Ratseies Ghost* (1605), "The very best have beene content to goe home at night with fifteen pence share apeece." An allusion to the sharing board occurs in the epilogue to Brome's *The English Moor*. The term and the thing it implies were both still in use in Post-Restoration days.

² Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, ii, 331, is half disposed to assign the character to the younger Pallant, forgetful of the fact that in 1613 he was scarcely eight years old.

wich Strowler(s)," there is a line reading, "I ordred the Drummer to beat a long Act."

In the extensive and undeniably interesting section on early prompt books, Dr. Greg, breaking ground new to him and otherwise little traversed, is less happy than in the earlier part of his commentary. Certainly, there is much truth in many of his deductions, but in my eyes the value of his careful investigation of the old playhouse manuscripts is seriously discounted by a serious misconception regarding several of them, a misconception leading, so far as they are concerned, to inaccurate approach. Dr. Greg begins his introduction by saying, "The papers reproduced and discussed in these volumes are actual playhouse documents used in the original productions of Elizabethan plays." Unless I very much mistake, this is incorrect. So far from being all actual playhouse documents, several of the prompt books discussed were prepared, not for London use, but for use on tour by country players. Though he makes passing reference to Dr. Boas's paper on "A Seventeenth Century Theatrical Repertoire" in *The Library* for July 1917, Dr. Greg wholly ignores Dr. Boas's contention therein made to the effect that the books of *The Two Noble Ladies*, *Edmond Ironside*, *Thomas of Woodstock*, and *The Captives* were all made and marked for the one country company. But the theory cannot be thus contemptuously dismissed, and I hope to demonstrate its validity. Nor is that all. There is good reason to believe that two other prompt books reckoned by Dr. Greg among the London originals—those of *The Parliament of Love* and *The Welsh Ambassador*—were prepared for the same country company, though at a different period.

What we first have to ask ourselves is, what is the prime denotement of a specially made country prompt book? To my mind, it lies in the lack of the censor's notes and of a licensing endorsement. Let us consider the circumstances of licensing. We know from a variety and an abundance of sources that from Tylney's day, say 1583, until the period of Herbert's retirement from the Mastership of the Revels shortly after the Restoration, the custom was to append the license to the manuscript of the play, writing it on the last page within an inch of the word "finis." All the early extant prompt books made for London companies testify as much. There were exceptions, but they were few. Usually there was room enough on the last page for the licensing endorsement, but where the text happened to extend right down to the bottom, the licenser had

perforce to write the license elsewhere. The fact that this occurred in connection with the book of *Sir John Barneveldt* shows that Sir Edmund Chambers was over-cautious when he doubted if it were the licensed copy, though the presence of the censor's notes should have allayed all his misgivings. When, then, there is room enough on the last page of an old prompt copy for a license—as in the case of *The Two Noble Ladies*—and the license is absent, we have some reason to assume that the book was made for country use; and if, as in the instance cited, we find minor players named in that book whose names recur in other prompt books preserved with it, we are also entitled to assume that all those books belonged to the one company.

In support of Dr. Boas's theory, I contend that the books of *The Two Noble Ladies*, *Edmond Ironside*, *Thomas of Woodstock* and *The Captives* were all prepared for the Company of the King's Revels, an exclusively rural organisation which toured from 1623 to 1627. Something needs to be said about the antecedents of this troupe, since the details are illuminative. With Queen Anne's death in 1619, the Red Bull players ceased to bear her name, but, on February 24, 1620, a license was issued under the signet constituting them the Company of the Revels. On July 8, 1622, a warrant was issued for the granting of a patent to the same players to establish a company of boy-players under the style of the Children of the Revels, but for some reason the patent never materialised. In April 1623, precisely at the time of the dissolution of the Red Bull Company, a license was issued authorising the creation of a new company called the Children of the Revels, and empowering them to travel. And travel they did until 1627. The fact that the Revel Boys were an offshoot of the old Red Bull Company warrants us in assuming that they either inherited or appropriated some of the latest and freshest of the Red Bull plays, notably *The Two Noble Ladies*.

Among the names of the principals given in the license of April 9, 1623, are those of Thomas Bond and Edward Tobye. There are five players mentioned in the book of *The Two Noble Ladies*, and a "Mr. Bond" is one of them, and a player called Tobye came on as a servant in *Thomas of Woodstock*. In the latter piece, a certain (or rather uncertain) "George" figures, and he might have been either the George Stuteville who acted in *The Two Noble Ladies* and in *Edmond Ironside* or the George Bosegrave who is named with Bond and Tobye in the Revels license as one of the leading members

of the organisation. One cannot get away from the fact that all four plays are curiously interlinked, and in more than one way. The Taylor who appeared in *The Captives* appeared also in *The Two Noble Ladies*, and the Gibson whose name is to be found likewise in both those plays also figured in *Edmond Ironside*. Close association is again indicated by the fact that *The Two Noble Ladies* and *Edmond Ironside* were both annotated by the one hand.

The clinching argument in favour of all four books having been prepared for the one country company lies in the fact that while *The Captives* and *The Two Noble Ladies* have names of players in common, the two plays originally were produced at different theatres by different companies, the former by the Queen of Bohemia's Company at the Cockpit in September 1624, and the latter at the Red Bull by the Company of the Revels in 1620 or shortly after. Unfortunately, one cannot lay any stress upon the absence of a license from the book of *The Captives*, as it happened that no room was left on the last page for its appendage, but one can legitimately press into service the significant fact that the text is in Heywood's own hand and so slovenly written that hardly anybody could have read it but himself. Because of this illegibility, I thoroughly believe that, so far from being the original prompt copy, it consists of Heywood's first draft, or "foul papers" as they were called, which he had doubtless been careful enough to preserve.¹ The many corrections made *currente calamo* go to justify that conclusion. Since Heywood in his capacity as actor is wholly lost sight of after his disappearance from the Red Bull Company in 1619, it is not improbable that at one period he might have accompanied the Revels players on tour, and even have prompted his own play. Most investigators who have concerned themselves with *The Captives*, including Dr. Greg, halt between two opinions as to whether the textual annotations are in Heywood's hand or another's. I do not pretend to be able to determine the point, but if they were made by Heywood it would fortify the supposition that he had prompted his own play.

Now, as to my belief that the books of *The Parliament of Love* and *The Welsh Ambassador* were likewise made for the same country company but at a different period from the others. *A prima facie*

¹ Curiously enough, Dr. Greg, on p. 209, note 4, of his commentary, cites a "permissive direction" from the manuscript of the play, which, of itself, goes far to establish that it is composed of Heywood's foul papers, but without seeing its significance.

case for their association is advanced by the fact that the two are transcripts in the one hand. As prompt books both have been marked in a similar way, but in a way dissimilar to the others. It is surprising to find Dr. Greg saying of *The Welsh Ambassadors*, possibly because the book mentions no names of players, that it presents "no actual evidence of prompt use," since there is clear evidence to the contrary. The difference is that while normally in early days the calls were by players' names, the calls here are by the names of characters. This method eventually ousted the other and lasted down to our own time. It has a material advantage inasmuch as a prompt book marked in this way can be permanently used and by any company.

There may or may not be some significance in the fact that *The Parliament of Love* was produced at the Cockpit in November 1624, just two months after *The Captives*. What I do feel assured of is that there has been sad bungling over this manuscript. If *The Parliament of Love* was solely of Massinger's authorship, as the licensing record betokens, we should expect to find the text in Massinger's autograph, according to custom, but as the hand is not his, we have reason to suspect later transcription. It has been for long presumed that this manuscript was the original licensed copy, owing to the fact that a portion of the last page has been cut off (was, indeed, cut off before Malone's time) at the bottom. But I must again point out that licenses were written close to the author's "finis" and that there still remains space enough on the last page to contain a license. The fact that the books of this play and *The Welsh Ambassador* are in the one hand, taken with the high probability that the latter was a Red Bull play of a somewhat earlier period, goes to support the contention that *The Parliament of Love* is merely a later transcript. It may be, as has been suggested, that *The Welsh Ambassador* is identical with the play called *The Welsh Traveller*, licensed for the Company of the Revels on May 10, 1622, for Chalmers, to whom alone is due the preservation of the record, blundered more than once in his transcriptions from the Revels Accounts. The play undoubtedly had some topical allusiveness, and the period of its composition is indicated by the fact that in Jonson's *Masque of Augurs*, as given at Court on Twelfth Night, 1622, there are cryptic allusions to a Welsh ambassador and to Welsh pilgrims.

Nevertheless, after criticism has brought all its batteries to bear on

this notable book, there will still remain a residuum of great permanent value. It has proved already of considerable service to me, though I am far from being ill-informed on the matters it discusses, and the potentialities of its usefulness to others who, unlike me, are nearer the beginning than the end of their investigatory labours are beyond all question.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

Zum Problem der Überlieferung des Hamlet-Textes.

Von LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING. (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 83. Band, 4. Heft.) Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1931. Pp. 42. Mk. 1.55.

PROFESSOR SCHÜCKING has chosen for his paper a title that is unenlightening and even misleading, but in it he has given explicit form to a problem that has been at the back of the mind of many Shakespearian students, though it has seldom if ever been faced. *Hamlet*, according to the standard count, contains 3,942 lines of text: it is by several hundred lines the longest of Shakespeare's plays. Can such a play ever have been acted, or intended for acting, in its entirety, and if not, for what was it written? Now, if this were an isolated problem it might not be difficult to suggest an explanation. I have myself before now argued, accepting the orthodox view that Shakespeare more than once revived and rewrote an earlier play (a view of which I have become rather sceptical), that in the course of his work he got carried away by his subject, and in the end produced a piece that broke all bounds of theatrical convenience and could, as it stood, be intended to appeal to readers only. But, in fact, as Professor Schücking is the first to show in detail, the length of *Hamlet* is not an isolated phenomenon. Although the next longest piece in the Shakespearian canon, *Richard III*, runs to only 3,598 lines, no less than thirteen, or over a third, exceed 3,000, while only two fall short of 2,000, namely, the early *Comedy of Errors* (1,767) and the probably mutilated *Macbeth* (1,943). Six have between 2,000 and 2,500, fifteen between 2,500 and 3,000. (Professor Schücking's table omits *Henry VIII*.) It has consequently been assumed, since tables of length (however imperfect) were available for Shakespeare's plays only, that 3,000 lines was the average or

normal length of an Elizabethan play, with the corollary that (contrary to all experience) 3,000 lines could be acted in a little over two hours. This assumption Professor Schücking, in the first half of his paper, sets out to refute. He has counted the lines in some seventy plays (outside the Shakespeare and Jonson canons) written for the London stage between 1586 and 1616, which he reckons to be over a third of those extant, and finds the result as follows :

- 5 plays under 1,500 lines
- 11 plays between 1,500 and 2,000 lines
- 19 plays between 2,000 and 2,400 lines
- 12 plays between 2,400 and 2,600 lines
- 20 plays between 2,600 and 3,000 lines
- 3 plays over 3,000 (none up to 3,050).

He concludes out of this diversity, and taking into account the fact that the duration of performance seems to have been usually little if any over two hours, that the normal Elizabethan play as performed cannot have averaged more than 2,500 lines. If this is so, it is not *Hamlet* that is exceptional, but Shakespeare's work generally, and the fact becomes all the more significant when we take into consideration Jonson's plays, with line-numbers such as 2,876 (*Every man in*), 3,287, 3,136, 3,137, 3,080, 3,007, and 4,262 (*B. Fair*).

Now these figures are not without their difficulties and possible pitfalls. In a recent and interesting article (*R.E.S.*, January 1932, viii. 29) Mr. Hart showed how the current counts for Shakespeare's plays, based on the Globe edition, exaggerate the length of the prose in respect of the verse portions, and I should suppose that even Mr. Hart's own figures still tend to lengthen Shakespeare's plays in comparison with those outside the canon as determined by Professor Schücking. But, whether this is so or not, it does not appear to affect the basis of the argument. This rests, not on any nicety of calculation, but on broad figures. If 2,500 lines is the norm for Elizabethan plays, then the fact that twenty-eight out of thirty-six of Shakespeare's exceed this number, several by a half or more, calls insistently for explanation, even if the actual figures have to be scaled down somewhat in a minuter computation.

Professor Schücking's thesis, developed in the second half of his paper, is that Shakespeare wrote his plays not for the stage only but for the reading public as well. This, of course, involves the assump-

tion that his themes, or at least many of them, required for their proper literary development more space than the conditions of the contemporary theatre allowed. If one grants the inherent plausibility of this condition, the arguing of which might present difficulties, the theory is certainly an attractive one, and I suspect contains at least a measure of truth. At the same time it would be idle to blink the considerable difficulties in the way of its acceptance. If Shakespeare wrote for the reading public he was certainly very unsuccessful in bringing his writings before it. At his death half his plays remained unpublished, whereas Ben Jonson, most of whose plays (in the 1616 collection) were produced by the same company, took care that they should be duly printed. Of the (say) eighteen Shakespearian plays printed in the lifetime of the poet, probably at least eight originally appeared in a stolen and surreptitious form, and while the texts issued in a more regular manner very likely appeared with his approval, there is not the slightest evidence that he superintended the printing of a single one, and indeed it is highly improbable that he did. In contrast with this we have his two long poems authoritatively published and provided with dedications by the author. If Shakespeare, throughout his career as a playwright, say from 1592 to 1612, was writing for readers as well as for actors, then the absence of any fact to which we can point as evidence that he had any concern for publication is certainly remarkable.

No doubt there are things that may be said in at least partial explanation. Rightly or wrongly the company appears to have thought it against their interest that their plays should appear in print while they still held the stage, and Shakespeare may have acquiesced in and even approved this policy. That would be in no way inconsistent with an intention of ultimate publication. That publication was delayed may have been due to Shakespeare's plays having a longer life than most men's on the boards. That we may readily believe. And Shakespeare was still a young man when he retired to Stratford; he was only fifty-two when he died. He may possibly have thought that the occasion for publication had not yet arrived, and that he had time before him. That, as Professor W. Keller has suggested, would lend additional point to his first editors' remark: "It had been a thing, we confess, worthy to have been wished, that the author himself had lived to have set forth and overseen his own writings; but since it has been ordained otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envy

his friends the office of their care and pain to have collected and published them." It is even possible that once away from the literary world of London Shakespeare may have himself lost interest in the fate of works he had laboriously composed for the readers of distant ages. There have been stranger revulsions in the history of literature. Weight may also be allowed to a suggestion put forward by Professor Schücking, namely, that the readers that Shakespeare had in mind and for whom he wrote those profound musings that so often raise our wonder when we think of the rough audience of the Bankside, were less possible worshippers in the future or the general public of his own day, than certain choice aristocratic spirits, like Pembroke and Montgomery, patrons among whom his works might circulate discreetly in manuscript. It is true that we have no evidence of the distribution of such private copies in the case of Shakespeare's plays or during his lifetime, and if they ever existed we may feel justifiably aggrieved by the fate that has deprived us of any example, while preserving such things as *The Witch*, *The Humorous Lieutenant*, and *Bonduca* a few years later.

Something there may be in all these attempts to explain the paradox in which the acceptance of Professor Schücking's thesis lands us. But it must be admitted that it involves a good deal of guessing. And however attractive and indeed plausible the theory may be, the cautious critic, while careful to keep this line of speculation open, will probably also keep an open mind concerning it.

W. W. GREG.

Poets and Playwrights. By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. The University of Minnesota Press. 1930. Pp. x+304.

MR. STOLL is a distinguished American scholar who has lectured in this country—one of the essays in this volume was read before the Shakespeare Association at King's College, London, in 1921—and whose *Shakespeare Studies* (1927) was an interesting contribution to Shakespearian criticism. This volume is a collection of essays and lectures written during the last ten years, many of them having appeared in periodicals. They vary considerably in content and style, from a delightful lecture on Spenser, containing "*argumenta ad feminam* suggested by the occasion," to an essay on "Shakespeare and the Moderns," an involved discussion wherein a distracting

wealth of literary illustration and a metaphorical style (e.g. pp. 90-91) combine to make the involuted argument difficult to follow. In the first essay, on Cleopatra, the author expounds more fully "what is meant by characterisation without psychology, particularly by the differentiation of the speech," ideas which he had previously adumbrated in his *Shakespeare Studies* (pp. 63-70). He then proceeds to show how Shakespeare, employing such technique, is able to present the character of the Queen as "a living thing" and artistically consistent. "In her inconsistency she is consistent. But the chief means by which the dramatist makes her so is the identity, through all her changes, of her tone and manner. She changes as a vivacious, amorous, designing woman changes, not so as to lose her identity, like Proteus."

In another essay, Mr. Stoll speaks with wisdom and experience on "Certain Fallacies and Irrelevancies in the Literary Scholarship of the Day." He draws attention to the futility of many of the dissertations undertaken for the Higher Degrees, and illustrates, with amusing examples, the fallacy inherent in the work of many scholars who "acknowledge that evidence bit by bit is not considerable, and may be questionable, but consider the effect of it to be cumulative." Professor R. W. Chambers, in this country, once suggested that all scholars should study the laws of probability: Mr. Stoll makes no blunders in this sort of calculus, and so ensures that his volume will for ever escape that *index librorum mortuorum*, where he would list the titles of many others.

G. N. G.

The Works of Congreve. Comedies : Incognita : Poems.

Edited by F. W. BATESON. London : Peter Davies. 1930.

Pp. xxviii+507. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS selection from the *Works of Congreve*, which includes all the Comedies and some fifteen of the Poems, has been carefully edited by Mr. F. W. Bateson. He takes as the basis of his text of the plays and poems the *Works of Mr. William Congreve*, 1710, but he has compared this edition of the plays with the earlier quarto editions and recorded his findings in a compact set of Bibliographical Notes. To the whole he puts a lively preface in which he says some suggestive things about his author's art, and he includes a number of the good

remarks of earlier critics. He seems, however, quite to overstate his case when he observes :

It has been customary to praise Congreve's "style," and to overlook the "styles" of Millamant, Lady Wishfort, Valentine and the rest. Congreve's real achievement, which sets him apart from every other dramatist, including Shakespeare, is his differentiation of character, within the limits of a recognisably individual style, by the *manner* of the dialogue. . . . Congreve, when he is at his best, can give the impression that every sentence almost could not have been spoken by any one else or in any other way.

But surely this is exactly what has been said about Shakespeare by a score of critics. Hamlet and Falstaff both speak the prose of Shakespeare but with a difference ; Mr. Granville-Barker can talk of Shakespeare's individualising a character in the music of the verse.

The reading of the plays is greatly facilitated by the very brief notes at the foot of the page, which explain allusions and meanings. The editor, however, should have made it clear why he explains the passage in *The Way of the World*, "But when he's drunk he's as loving as the monster in *The Tempest*," as a reference to Sycorax in the Dryden-Davenant version of the play and not just to Shakespeare's Caliban.

P. ALEXANDER.

A Newton Among Poets. By CARL GRABO. The University of North Carolina Press ; London : H. Milford. 1930. Pp. xiv+208. 13s. 6d. net.

MR. GRABO seems a little uncertain as to what his contention is. He calls the book *A Newton Among Poets*, and quotes Professor A. N. Whitehead as saying, "If Shelley had been born a hundred years later, the twentieth century would have seen a Newton among chemists," surely a rather meaningless conjecture for a great thinker, more especially as Newton devoted considerable study to chemistry without making any striking discovery—or is that the point ? This and other indications would seem to imply that Mr. Grabo was concerned to show that Shelley was a man of remarkable scientific intuition fitted by disposition and abilities to make profound discoveries in the field of natural philosophy. He proceeds, however, to prove that Shelley was a disciple of Erasmus Darwin, who wrote a little sense combined with a prodigious amount of nonsense in

stilted prose and mechanical verse. He goes on to contend, in our opinion quite successfully, that Shelley had read widely among the scientific literature of his time, particularly Herschel and Beccaria, and that he carried away many odd scraps of information or speculation, and afterwards used them. All this is very well and very interesting, but where is Newton? Is Milton a Laplace among poets because he knew and used something of the astronomical ideas of a previous century?

As a young man Shelley carried out chemical experiments in his study, apparently in a very unsystematic and casual way, and thought the shadow of the first balloon to glide over Africa would annihilate slavery for ever. He had just such a vague enthusiasm for the possibilities of science as certain poetic and clerical readers of popular works on physics and astronomy have to-day. Mr. Grabo proves beyond doubt that Shelley had passages from Beccaria and Erasmus Darwin in his mind when he wrote certain passages in the *Prometheus*. To trace these allusions is an interesting pursuit, and to find Herschel in the lyric beginning

Our spoil is won,
Our task is done

an ingratiating pastime. "To the dull weed some sea-worm battens on" is an allusion to iodine. The "crimson air" in "With a serener light and crimson air" identifies the earth's exhalations as nitrous oxide. It is all very possible, and adds greatly to our enjoyment of Shelley to learn that the crimson air is no vague poetic fancy. I regret, however, that Mr. Grabo occasionally weakens, as when he says of

Leave man even as a leprous child is left

that "'leprous' I suppose to mean not literally infected with leprosy but with some skin disease"; and of

Echoes we : listen
We cannot stay :
As dew-stars glisten
Then fade away—

in an elegant sentence that "the echoes of Act Two are not echoes properly at all." We have had too little of this kind of thing since Bentley's comments on Shakespeare and Milton.

The book is full of sources, but if we are going to sources let us go to sources. Why Pope and Erasmus Darwin instead of de

Villars for the sylphs and salamanders, why Herschel and Kant instead of Wright of Oldham for the origin of the nebular hypothesis? Surely Shelley would have seen these books.

It is claimed on the wrapper that the book "is a thorough demonstration that Shelley's exquisite lyricism has a most carefully conceived frame of hard intellectual meaning." Another possible statement would be that Shelley's head was full of scraps of scientific reading, which then suggested to him passages of vague grandeur, as popular accounts of the theory of relativity suggest great spiritual truths to bishops. Let us, however, neglect this commonplace alternative and pay tribute to Mr. Grabo's industry and ingenuity in the cause of English poetry as understood in certain academic circles. I hope to read Mr. Grabo on *The Tempest* some day. But he should study Bentley.

E. N. DA C. ANDRADE.

Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism. Edited by THOMAS MIDDLETON RAYSOR. London: Constable. 1930. 2 vols. Pp. lxii+256; vi+375. 42s. net.

MR. RAYSOR'S admirably edited volumes of *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism* contain material hitherto unprinted, which is of the utmost importance to our estimate of its value. He gives us for the first time two versions of the lectures—one from the notes of Tomalin, and one from the report in a Bristol newspaper of 1813—neither of which has previously been known to students—besides some material from the papers of Crabb Robinson which, though published by the reviewer, has "not hitherto [been] collected in any edition of Coleridge's criticism." More important still are the marginalia scribbled by the poet in two editions of Shakespeare's plays, and the fragments of lecture-notes discovered among Coleridge MSS. at the British Museum and in note-books in the possession of Lord Coleridge. Finally, there are long letters by Coleridge on Plagiarism (written on the back of prospectuses for the second lecture of 1811-1812, now in the British Museum) and on the proposed lectures of 1819. The latter was first printed in the *Literary Gazette* of 1834.

It would be difficult to over-estimate the value of these additions to our knowledge of Coleridge's criticism of Shakespeare, either in their revelation of the mind of the writer or in the light they cast upon his subject. For if we disregard for the moment all that has

been said in praise or in dispraise of so-called "romantic" criticism and ignore the exact place held by Coleridge in its historical evolution, the fact remains that, for many of us, either directly, or indirectly through those they influenced, Coleridge's dicta have served to irradiate and illuminate the inner meaning of the plays. If it be true that his praise is on occasion indiscriminating, it is nevertheless certain that his appreciation frequently helps him to arrive at imaginative interpretation beyond the reach of temperate analysis. Mr. Raysor speaks justly of Coleridge's unsurpassed "knowledge of human motives" and "profound insight into human nature." They may have led him astray in his estimate of Hamlet into whom he read too much of himself; but by their aid he first showed the psychological import of many a speech and action.

Mr. Raysor's carefully written Introduction examines Coleridge's critical development and contemporary influences upon him as well as his positive achievement. Coleridge started necessarily as the opponent of neo-classical criticism and of Johnson's *Preface*: that was inevitable, if, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, he was to establish his own new critical position. One consequence of the antagonism was the refusal to admit defects which had been over-emphasised by his predecessors, and an assumption of the attitude of pious reverence which revolts many present-day readers. One may concede the exaggeration while recognising the historical reason for its existence. It should not alienate the modern student of criticism, who is not likely to fall into a similar error.

Mr. Raysor points out that Coleridge's defence of Shakespeare's violation of the unities shows him at his best. "In discussing this crucial subject he borrowed very largely from Schlegel and other critics, but he also produced some of his own most original and valuable criticism"—particularly in his interpretation of dramatic illusion. Thus, he says, "... stage-presentations are to produce a sort of temporary half-faith, which the spectator encourages in himself and supports by a voluntary contribution on his own part, because he knows that it is at all times in his power to see the thing as it really is" (i, 200). Mr. Raysor elaborates his argument that "this interpretation of dramatic illusion is a deeply significant achievement of literary criticism, because it gives for the first time a simple and obviously sound explanation of a problem on which critics had been confused for more than a century and a half."

All through the eighteenth century it was the practice to contrast

Jonson's "learned sock" with Shakespeare warbling "his native woodnotes wild." Coleridge, therefore, from his earliest lectures set out to prove that Shakespeare's "judgement was commensurate with his genius," i.e. that his genius was not, and, in the nature of things, could not be lawless, but, on the contrary, necessarily worked in conformity with law. Only this law was innate—not imposed from without, but shaped from within according to the natural development of organic form. Coleridge's criticism consisted for the most part of attempts to reveal the conscious purpose underlying Shakespeare's art, his explanations being "made delicate and imaginative and sure" by reason of his own creative genius. As an example of the complete success of this method of criticism—original and independent of suggestion by Schlegel or by any other—Mr. Raysor takes Coleridge's treatment of the exposition of the dramas, "the scenes of preparation, above all in Hamlet." "His highest achievements" as a critic "are in his penetrating analyses of Shakespearian characters and in his profoundly imaginative re-creations of the full impression which Shakespeare may make in a mind more sensitive, more just and experienced and more intelligent than the minds of normal men."

Mr. Raysor calls attention to the fact, often overlooked, that Coleridge seems almost completely indifferent to Shakespearian humour and that, consequently, he has little to say of the Falstaff plays, which he neglects in favour of *Richard II*; while of the comedies he prefers *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Tempest*, the most lyrical, to the rest. Similarly, though the four great tragedies are given precedence, his lyrical interests appear in the attention given to *Romeo and Juliet*, compared with the others. This predilection for the lyrical in Shakespearian drama points to Coleridge's own poetic leanings, but it should not blind us to the unusually keen analytic power which he manifests in his criticism. This differentiates him from the "romantic" type of critic, "impressionists" such as "Lamb or Hazlitt or Pater."

Mr. Raysor's *Introduction* thus forms an excellent summary account of Coleridge's critical achievement, but it must not deflect our attention from the importance of the additions made by these volumes to the body of his critical material. The editor is emphatic upon this point. The reports of Coleridge's lectures are sometimes good, he says, but "they are generally far inferior to the criticism embodied in the marginalia." "Even in the lectures for which

manuscripts remain, Coleridge seldom attained the excellence which was almost habitual in his marginalia. . . . The fragment was the literary *genre* which was natural to Coleridge, and only in the fragments of marginalia was he entirely himself. He could carry over the results and use them only in part."

These "hints and first thoughts," as Coleridge called the contents of his memorandum books, are of outstanding importance and deserve detailed examination by all students of both Shakespeare and Coleridge. They make one wish that some one equally qualified would examine and report upon still unpublished Coleridge marginalia, *e.g.* in some of the volumes of Schlegel, etc., which originally belonged to Crabb Robinson and are now in Dr. Williams's Library.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

Robert Browning und Die Antike. Von Dr. ROBERT SPINDLER, Englische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von MAX FÖRSTER, Bd. VII. Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz. 1930. Pp. 382. Zwei Teile in einem Bande. M.50.

DR. SPINDLER devotes the first of his two substantial volumes entirely to *Balaustion's Adventure* and *Aristophanes' Apology*; in his second volume he discusses the shorter poems dealing with classical antiquity, not chronologically, but according to subject-matter; he gives an exhaustive list of the various classical allusions in the other poems and in the letters; and he concludes with a chapter on Browning as a translator. Defending this arrangement, he says that for him the question of Browning's sources, though important, is only one of the questions he has set himself to answer; and that he desires to show not only *what* Browning borrowed from the classics, but *why* he borrowed it, to define his general attitude to classical antiquity.

This statement raises expectations which unfortunately are not fulfilled, for without it one would not readily conclude that Dr. Spindler was not mainly preoccupied with *Quellenforschung*. There is, indeed, a certain amount of general or philosophical criticism, but it is too often encumbered with a mass of irrelevant detail or sandwiched between matter which should have been placed elsewhere. In the chapter on *Balaustion's Adventure*, Dr. Spindler has two interesting and important questions to discuss: What was the

secret of Browning's interest in Euripides? What was Euripides' conception of the characters of Admetus and Heracles, and how does it differ from Browning's? After having given a fairly full and satisfactory answer to the first question, Dr. Spindler gives an admirable summary of the framework of the poem. This is as it should be, and we are now ready for the comparison between Browning and Euripides. However, Dr. Spindler keeps us waiting during twenty pages while he engages in a minute investigation into the possible sources of the Balaustion part of the poem; and when at last he comes to his second main subject, his discussion is clogged and impeded by clusters of quotations from almost every criticism or review of Browning's poem that has ever appeared. And as for the fascinating question of Euripides' intention in the *Alcestis*, he discusses various opinions, but leaves it doubtful whether he has formed a clear and coherent one himself. His discussion of *Aristophanes' Apology* is, in view of the hopes raised in his preface, even more unsatisfactory. After devoting ten pages to a minute investigation into the compatibility of the time, place and details of Browning's poem with known historical facts, after giving a synopsis, an analysis, and an elaborate paraphrase, he at last addresses himself to the question, What was Browning's attitude to Euripides and Aristophanes respectively? This answer is sound and reasonable so far as it goes, but his reader could have been given the materials for a judgment by means of an infinitely less lengthy and laborious exposition. Perhaps the best piece of general criticism is contained in his brief concluding chapter, where he summarises the history of Browning's classical studies, and remarks that what finally drew him to the Greeks was not the romantic gospel of simplicity, grandeur and perfection, but the transcendental element in Plato and the tragedians.

But while Dr. Spindler's book is badly proportioned and not specially distinguished as a piece of literary criticism, it will be indispensable to all who wish to investigate Browning's remarkable knowledge of Greek history and literature; for the author has spared no pains, and has accumulated an amount of material which future investigation will hardly be able to increase.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Richard Doddridge Blackmore : His Life and Novels. By QUINCY GUY BURRIS. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XV, No. 4.) Urbana : University of Illinois Press. 1930. 10½ in. Pp. 219, bibliog., index. \$1.25 paper.

It is useful to have a summary of what is known about Blackmore and his works, but it is rather a pity that to expand this dissertation to regulation size the author has inserted so much padding. The formidable scheme set out on p. 22, evidently framed for general application to academic theses and to satisfy boards of examiners, has instigated whole chapters of irrelevant discussion. Thus, nearly half the book deals with "possible influences upon Blackmore," "novelists remote from Blackmore," "novelists who approach Blackmore more nearly," and so on, the author himself, very naturally, fearing that the reader will think he has "strained too far in finding similarities," or finding at the end that "only a very slender thread connects" such and such a writer with the object of his study. The rest of the book is more to the point, and there is an appendix of letters that have never before been collected, throwing some faint gleams of light on the man and his interests.

Blackmore was not a single-speech novelist, as he is usually regarded; the one book of his that gained inordinate popularity is probably not even his best. But though an admirable man, and a writer who has not had overmuch attention from serious criticism, he is not very interesting. Even were the material forthcoming, we cannot imagine such a thing as a full-length biography of Blackmore. About his personal concerns there is not much to say; he seems to have deliberately avoided providing anything; and his literary work, in spite of its genuine merits, has little historical importance, originating nothing and influencing no one, except that his first success gave encouragement to other romancers and historical novelists, especially in the United States.

Even *Lorna Doone* hardly stands re-reading. In the long outline here given, the famous story sounds so ultra-romantic, so jejune, and even childish, that we are disillusioned. So, too, with the analysis of the other novels. Mr. Burris finds that they hinge almost invariably upon three devices—abduction and rescue, the problem of a disputed inheritance, and a belated interlude reciting the antecedents of the main story. In short, the plots are essentially melo-

dramatic. Several are really absorbing stories, and the characters pleasing; but Blackmore's novels would have been dismissed as mere circulating library fiction of rather superior quality if they had not possessed one merit usually to seek in those commodities, an excellent prose style. Making allowance for Ruskinese and the emotional, semi-metrical rhythms of mid-Victorian word-painting, we shall find Blackmore's writing a continual delight. He was not an ordinary purveyor of three-volume novels for the market; he wrote for his own pleasure. He was also a scholar, with high standards of taste. The Blundell's schoolboy and Oxford M.A. loved Virgil and Theocritus and translated the *Georgics* and the *Idylls*. His word-painting was after the best models, and in every page he wrote he was continually saying shrewd and charming things, even if he never uttered anything profound.

Word-painting is often wearisome; Blackmore's seldom is; and this particular item of his local colour is probably one reason, not insisted upon by Mr. Burris, for the singular popularity of *Lorna Doone*. If Mr. Burris had ever visited the region still called the Lorna Doone country, he would have come across many evidences of this. Blackmore's pictures of the Badgeworthy Water and the famous slide have a lushness and romantic exaggeration, which are rather amusing to one who has fished for trout there; but even the lushness is seducing to the uncritical. Elsewhere he avoids this excess, and compared with his most of the descriptive passages in the novels of that time sound crude. Blackmore was also a good story-teller, in recounting an exciting episode especially. "Crocker's Hole," in *Tales from the Telling House*, is a fascinating account of a fishing exploit. Why does Mr. Burris look for a "possible debt" here to Izaak Walton? Blackmore was an angler, and knew as much about loaches as his great predecessor. It is as futile as the quest for influences in Scott, Captain Marryat, Mrs. Gaskell, George Eliot, or the question whether Blackmore had read Wordsworth. Whether Blackmore had read him or not Wordsworth oriented the minds of the Victorians to nature, and the novelist certainly did not escape the general tendency. Mr. Burris only concludes, however, that it is possible "Wordsworth's deep and abiding joy in nature had some effect upon Blackmore," and that "the differences between his novels and those of the novelists just mentioned are so vast and of such a significance that the similarities we have discovered are pigmied." He sees that the Doone legend is suspect. The present

reviewer remembers reading, when he was a small boy, the story called "The Doones of Exmoor" in the *Leisure Hour* of 1863, and felt himself quite an authority on the subject when he met with the more full-blooded romance of *Lorna Doone*. The Doones are a myth originating in trivial facts, turned to romantic account by Blackmore and others, and to an impudent hoax by the authoress of *A Short History of the Original Doones*.

The author of *Lorna Doone* preferred market-gardening to writing books, and in one of the letters here printed, remarks that he would rather have a trowel in his hand than a pen. Perchance the next thesis on Blackmore will deal with this side of his activities, and will be submitted to the faculty of Horticulture in some American University. There is quite as good material.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom.
New Series, Vol. IX. Edited by JOHN BAILEY. London:
Humphrey Milford. 1930. Pp. x+148. 7s. net.

SPECIAL interest attaches to the paper on "John Bunyan," which opens this volume, as the last written work of W. L. Courtney, suggested by the Bunyan Tercentenary of 1928. It is most regrettable that the essay, which has been prepared for publication by Mrs. Courtney, should have been left by its author incomplete, in view of the interesting lines of investigation suggested, especially with regard to Bunyan's mental growth and his attitude towards Calvinism. Professor Dover Wilson's study of *The Schoolmaster in Shakespeare's Plays* strikes a happy medium between fact and speculation. Abundant evidence, cited from plays of every type and period, and extending from full length character portrayal to casual allusion or imagery, all points to one conclusion, that Shakespeare had no love of schools or pedagogues. Of recent years, "Shakespeare the man" has had more and more to abide our question; and who is better qualified to pronounce upon the particular subject at issue than a Shakespearian authority who is also a Professor of Education? Despite the implication of Mr. John Bailey in his prefatory note, we question whether the average reader will complain that Miss Clemence Dane is unfair to him in her witty,

yet judicious, lecture upon "The Writer's Partner." On the contrary, her fellow-writers might well object that the reader has more than his due, and that, in the debate between Miss Dane and a contemporary novelist, defending the artist's detachment, the last word has not been said. The biographical section of Professor J. G. Robertson's paper upon "Gotthold Ephraim Lessing" makes a pathetic story of genius and industry unrecognised; in the latter part of his paper Professor Robertson leaves the beaten track by dwelling upon the achievement of Lessing, "a good European and a great European in the spacious eighteenth century," as playwright and dramatic critic. Mr. A. Yusuf Ali, discussing "The Religion of Rabindranath Tagore," examines the respective contributions of Hindu, Muslim and European influences, pleading, in conclusion, for a synthesis of spiritual ideals from diverse sources as a basis of Indian culture. Mr. Evan Morgan, treating of "Some Aspects of Mysticism in Verse," stresses the "straightforward, fearless expression, simple diction" of genuine mystical poetry as contrasted with "the wool-gathering of a lazy poetaster, inert, flabby, vague and fruitless" sometimes mistaken for it. Mr. Morgan's specimen of his own poetry is welcome, but we question whether many readers will concur unreservedly with the statement that "mysticism is inbred in every poet or he is no poet at all." Mr. Sanki Ichikawa concludes the volume with a study of "English Influence on Japanese," in particular of English loan-words which have passed into common usage.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

The Nineteen-Twenties: Literature and Ideas in the Post-War Decade. By A. C. WARD. Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1930. Pp. xii+222. 5s. net.

FOR most men and women the Great War lies as a barrier reef across the remembrance of things past, dividing our experiences and thoughts into a before and after. And Mr. Ward, as an observer with us, summarises the impressions and sensations of many. Social intercourse has lost its former character; economic theory its authority; industry its markets; literature and art fumble uncertainly; daylight struggles fitfully through soiled and darkened windows; and Mr. Ward diagnoses the period he surveys as "A Decade of

Despair." Unlike those, however, who seek an escape from the present, he is "glad to be alive in it."

His running commentary on men, affairs and books, chiefly the last of these three, has, in consequence, a power of awakening interest, for he has enjoyed his reading and his reactions to modern life. If, in the main, a traditionalist, he has a friendly acquaintance with modernism in its various guises. He writes with a manifest responsiveness to the traditional experimentalism of Bridges' *Testament of Beauty*; but the verbal antics of E. E. Cummings are not anathema to him; and he is rightly appreciative of the intellectual and imaginative gifts of Miss Edith Sitwell.

Mr. Ward finds in modernist experiments an attempt to use art as an instrument for the communication of sensation, as opposed to a method of imitation and description. But is the modernist poet proposing to himself a theory differing in any essential from the primary intention of, say, the *Lyrical Ballads*? Coleridge explains that the authors hoped to communicate emotion "by the modifying colours of imagination." And no device which is wholly arbitrary, renouncing imitation and description, could communicate anything, even to its author. But Mr. Ward is conscious of the difficulty, and does not force his distinction to a logical end.

On the whole he is content with the part of the commentator; and this is the safe course for a contemporary onlooker. He may note the relative and leave time to award the absolute values. And, limiting himself in range and outlook, Mr. Ward has written a book which is at once judicious and invigorating. He has an apt and unhesitating style, which enables him to move easily over the broken ground from pre-war survivors to modernists, to satirists and scourgers of a world in transition, historians and critics of the war, Lytton Strachey and the experimentalists in biography, post-war moralists, and even humorists.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Anglo-Irish Literature, 1200-1582. By ST. JOHN D. SEYMOUR.
Cambridge: University Press. 1929. Pp. ix+170. 12s. 6d.
net.

IN this interesting volume—the first attempt to deal with the subject as a whole—Archdeacon Seymour sets out what is known of the

literature of the English settlers in Ireland in the Middle Ages. He has, indeed, added a chapter on Richard Stanihurst, but one cannot help feeling that this fantastic figure belongs properly to the beginnings of Modern Anglo-Irish literature and might well have been omitted from the present study. Mr. Seymour no doubt felt that the paucity of his material justified this addition, but, as will appear later, there were other means of extending the range of the book of which Mr. Seymour has not availed himself. At any rate he passes in review in a series of interesting chapters the *chanson de geste* of *Dermot and the Earl*, the poetry, French and English, in Harley MS. 913, the work of Jofroi of Waterford, the evidences for the religious drama in Ireland, the work of FitzRalph of Armagh, the curious record of the trial of Dame Alice Kyteler, the English translation of Giraldus and some minor pieces of more or less interest. The reader of the book will get a good general idea of all this material, and Mr. Seymour's versions of the pieces from the Harley MS. will be read with pleasure by those who are deterred by their linguistic difficulties as they appear in Heuser's *Kildare Gedichte*.

It is, none the less, a pity that Mr. Seymour has not represented to himself and conveyed to us some picture of the curious life out of which these fragments—for they are no more than that—have survived. Anglo-Norman literature in Ireland is only a beginning, a promise of which unkind fate denied the performance. It was at the end of the thirteenth century that the English colony first became conscious of itself as a separate thing, divided at differing distances, as it were, from England and from native Ireland. Mr. Seymour denies himself and us the study of the chronicles, the chartularies and registers in which we see this consciousness at work. It was probably the invasion of the Bruces in 1315 that by its consequences prevented the development that might have been looked for. The recovery of Irish Gaelic literature in the fourteenth century, and the winning over of the great Anglo-Irish families in the West and South to the Irish way of life further tipped the balance against the young literature of English origin. By the fifteenth century the Pale had been narrowed to a slender strip of land, and the battle of the languages—Irish, French and English—had gone in favour of Irish. The chance of a real Anglo-Irish literature in medieval Ireland was by that time irretrievably lost.

Something has no doubt gone from us in the wholesale destruction

of manuscripts. This could have been in some degree established by an examination of borrowings into Irish literature from French and English. Thus, an unknown version of *Guy of Warwick* is attested by the Irish version which differs from all known French and English texts. The Middle-English Charter of Christ poem is represented by two versions in prose and verse. And the love poetry of Professor O'Rahilly's *Dánta Grádha* attests the presence of a *chanson* literature in Anglo-Norman Ireland otherwise only represented by the tantalising fragments in Bishop Ledrede's register. Considerable remains of Arthurian literature in Irish still await proper investigation. And there are other evidences of the influence of foreign romance on the Irish tradition.

The Latin literature current in medieval Ireland was far more extensive than would be gathered from this book. How much of this was due to the Anglo-Irish, and how much to the native monasteries still awaits investigation. Mr. Seymour, it is true, deliberately disclaims any intention of travelling through "arid stretches of theological literature" and doubts whether the work would prove worth the doing. We who are laymen do not share this churchman's distaste for what after all was a main part of medieval life and literature, and are certain, from personal experience, that the work would have been well worth the doing.

Nevertheless a writer may with some justice claim that he has a right to choose the limits within which he is to work, and Mr. Seymour does well what he set out to do. But the full history of Anglo-Irish literature in the Middle Ages still remains to be written.

ROBIN FLOWER.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LVI (Neue Folge XLIV), January 1932—

Der Mitteilungsvorgang und die innere Sprachform (W. Leopold),
pp. 1-22.

Sprache, Satz, Syntax, Stil (L. Morsbach), pp. 23-39.

Ae. *orcneās* (W. Krogmann), pp. 40-42.

The Date of *Lazamon's Brut* (H. B. Hinckley), pp. 43-57.
Circa 1160.

Zu mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen (F. Holthausen), pp. 58-68.

Notes on *St. Katharina* and the *Hymn on the Five Joys of Mary*.

Form und Aufbau der Tragödien *Macbeth*, *Othello*, *Lear*, *Hamlet*—
ein Ausdruck des Wesens ihrer Handlungsträger (M. Klein),
pp. 69-100.

A Welsh Animal Tale in England (A. H. Krappe), pp. 101-03.

The king's daughter changed into an owl.

Some Observations on New English Syntax (E. E. Ericson), pp. 108-12.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. VI, Parts 2 and 3, 1931—

The Earlier Owners of Books in John Selden's Library (John Sparrow),
pp. 263-71.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 16, January 1932—

Some Unpublished Letters to and from Dr. Johnson (edited by J. D.
Wright), pp. 32-76.

Three Dialogues by Hester Lynch Thrale (edited by M. Zamick),
pp. 77-114.

Charles and Fanny Burney in the Light of the New Thrale Corre-
spondence in the John Rylands Library (W. Wright Roberts),
pp. 115-36.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, January 1932—

From *Works and Days*: The Diary of "Michael Field" (edited by T.
Sturge Moore), pp. 1-13.

"Michael Field" and Robert Browning. Continued February, pp. 129-41.

DIALECT NOTES, Vol. VI, Part III, 1931—

An American Glossary (R. H. Thornton), pp. 100-216.

Foreword, Introductory Note, and Part I (A-Dip).

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 66, November 1931—

Notes on the Anglo-Saxon Pioneers (Gösta Langenfelt), pp. 161-244.
The Settlement of Britain.

Strophic Division in Middle English Alliterative Verse (Mabel Day),
pp. 245-48.

Zeugnisse für das Eindringen der englischen Literatur des 18.
Jahrhunderts in Deutschland (H. Jantzen), pp. 249-53.

Irrational Constructions (P. Fijn van Draat), pp. 254-57.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIV, February, 1932—

Notes on the Style of the *Essays of Elia* (A. G. van Kranendonk),
pp. 1-10.

On the Perfect of Experience (R. W. Zandvoort), pp. 11-20.

To laugh to scorn (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 20-21.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Vol. 160,
December 1931—

Two Manuscripts at Abbotsford (J. A. Falconer), pp. 205-12.
Scott's translations from German.

Byrons Manfred und Schumanns Musik (O. Lohmann), pp. 213-20.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXX, October
1931—

A Note on Semantic Borrowing in Old Saxon (H. V. Velten),
pp. 494-97.

From Old English, Gothic and Latin.

The Fight at Finnsburg: Guthlaf and the Son of Guthlaf (H. F.
Scott-Thomas), pp. 498-505.

Launce and Launcelot (Thomas B. Stroup), pp. 506-07.

Two Gentlemen of Verona and *Merchant of Venice*.

"This Poor Trash of Venice" (J. W. Draper), pp. 508-15.

Relations of Roderigo and Iago.

Terpsichore's Lament and "Pleasant Willy" (Brents Stirling),
pp. 556-62.

Spenser's *Tears of the Muses*.

Arthur Murphy and the War on Sentimental Comedy (J. H. Caskey),
pp. 563-77.

The Name of Shakspeare (John Morris), pp. 578-80.
Derivation.

January 1932—

The Pertinacious Cobold (Archer Taylor), pp. 1-9.
Variant versions of story in *Walking to the Mail*.

Smollett and Dr. Akenside (Howard Buck), pp. 10-26.

A Modern German *Hamlet* (Walter A. Reichart), pp. 27-50.
Hauptmann's adaptation.

The Date of *Hamlet* (H. D. Gray), pp. 51-61.

1601 ?

The Position of the Tales of the Manciple and the Parson on Chaucer's Canterbury Pilgrimage (James A. Work), pp. 62-65.

Notes on Past Pronunciations (Robert Withington), pp. 124-35.

The pronunciation of "Daughter"; some Elizabethan Rimes; some Popian Rimes.

LEUVENSCHÉ BIJDAGEN, Vol. XXIII, Parts 3 and 4, 1931—

Stray Etymological Notes (G. Langenfelt), pp. 117-31.

Spruce; *hullabaloo*; *cockalorum*; *caterpillar*; *Gopher Prairie*; Dutch loan-words in Middle English.

LIBRARY, Vol. XII, December 1931—

The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts (R. B. McKerrow), pp. 253-75.

A Note concerning "Mistress Crane" and the Martin Marprelate Controversy (Julia N. McCorkle), pp. 276-83.

Extant Manuscripts printed from by W. de Worde, with Notes on the Owner, Roger Thorney (Gavin Bone), pp. 284-306.

Three Manuscript Notes by Sir George Buc (W. W. Greg), pp. 307-21.

The Authorship of *The Prayse of Nothing* (Ralph M. Sargent), pp. 322-31.

An English Bookbinder's Ticket, c. 1610 ? (A. W. Pollard), pp. 332-35.

Egidius van der Erve and his English Printed Books (Frank Isaac), pp. 336-52.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXV, December 1931—

A Book from Donne's Library (John Sparrow), pp. 171-80.

Marginal notes in copy of *Epigrammata et Poematia Vetera*, ed. P. Pithou, Paris, 1590.

Bibliography (Arundell Esdaile), p. 194.

Note on the use of the terms *edition* and *issue*.

— January 1932—

The Survival of Scott (Agnes M. Mackenzie), pp. 270-78.

Shakespeare and *Sir Thomas More* (H. W. Crundell), pp. 288-89.

Further passage attributed to Shakespeare.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLVI, November 1931—

Beowulf and *Apollonius of Tyre* (C. O. Chapman), pp. 439-43.

A Note on *Beowulf* 760 (C. P. Lyons), pp. 443-44.

Alcuin's Use of Alliteration (J. D. A. Ogilvy), pp. 444-45.

Examples of the Legal Usage of *Fine*, sb., in 13th Century Anglo-Norman (Elsie Shanks), pp. 445-47.

"Every Vertu at his Reste" (E. E. Slaughtier), pp. 448-53.

Note on *The Parlement of Foules*, 376.

Note on the Tournament in the *Knights Tale* (Katharine Garvin), pp. 453-54.

A Note on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 700-02 (H. L. Savage), pp. 455-57.

A Source for Henryson's *Robene and Makyne* (W. Powell Jones), pp. 457-58.

Polonisms in the English of Conrad's *Chance* (A. P. Coleman), pp. 463-68.

On the Pronunciation of *Mourn* (K. Malone), pp. 470-72.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, December—

Spenser's Acquisition of Kilcolman (R. Heffner), pp. 493-98.

Date.

Spenser's *Legends and Court of Cupid* (E. A. Strathmann), pp. 498-501.

Comments on the Moral Allegory of the *Faerie Queene* (C. G. Osgood), pp. 502-07.

Three Notes on Randolph (Cyrus L. Day), pp. 507-10.

Further Comment on Randolph's Text (J. J. Parry and S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 510-12.

A Crux in *Much Ado* and its Solution (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 512-14.

Note on V. i. 19: "bid sorrow trudge"?

A Source for the First Quarto of *Henry V* (Barbara D. Simison), pp. 514-15.

The Brut.

Pope's Index to Beaumont and Fletcher (A. Warren), pp. 515-17.

MS. of incomplete index to the 1679 folio.

Campion, Variant-Readings (D. Lovett), p. 517.

In "There is a garden in her face."

The Text of *Love's Last Shift* (D. MacMillan), pp. 518-19.

The Original of Ravenscroft's *Anatomist*, and an Anecdote of Jemmy Spiller (E. T. Norris), pp. 522-26.

Vol. XLVII, January 1932—

The First English Translation of *Werther* (C. J. Hill), pp. 8-12.

Evidence that it was not by Richard Graves.

Marlowe's Rice "With a Powder" (H. Spencer), p. 35.

Note on *The Jew of Malta*, III. iv. 108.

February—

More American References to Blake before 1863 (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 87-88.

Coleridge, De Quincey, and Nineteenth-Century Editing (E. L. Griggs), pp. 88-90.

Wordsworth and Henry Headley (Marion H. Addington), p. 90.

A New Smollett Anecdote (Howard Buck), pp. 90-91.

From Bucke's *Life of Ahenside*.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

Smollett and Le Sage's *The Devil upon Crutches* (L. M. Knapp), pp. 91-93.

A Note on Smollett's Language (J. M. Purcell), pp. 93-94.

Pamela Nubile, L'Ecoissaise, and *The English Merchant* (Kathleen M. Lynch), pp. 94-96.

The Puritan's Ears in *A Tale of a Tub* (C. M. Webster), pp. 96-97.

A Note on Dryden's *Zimri* (J. Q. Wolf), pp. 97-99.

Chaucer's "Secte Saturnyn" (Amanda H. Miller), pp. 99-102.

Note on *The House of Fame*, 1432.

"Ah! What Avails" (Marion H. Addington), pp. 102-04.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXVII, January 1932—

The Lineage of *The Extasie* (Merritt Y. Hughes), pp. 1-5.

Milton's First Marriage, II (B. A. Wright), pp. 6-23.

Shakespeare's *Venice* (Violet M. Jeffery), pp. 24-35.

Horace Walpole's Memoir of the Poet Gray (Paget Toynbee), pp. 58-60.

Gray on the Origin and Date of *Amadis de Gaul* (Paget Toynbee), pp. 60-61.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIX, November 1931—

Spenser and Gabriel Harvey's *Letter-Book* (Josephine W. Bennett), pp. 163-86.

Letters supposed to be addressed to Spenser.

The Source of Milton's Pandemonium (Rebecca W. Smith), pp. 187-98.

St. Peter's at Rome?

The Beginnings of Subscription Publication in the Seventeenth Century (Sarah L. C. Clapp), pp. 199-224.

Pope on the Translators of Homer (Austin Warren), pp. 229-32.

"Blandamour" in the Percy-Ritson Controversy (Leah Dennis), pp. 232-34.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 17, Part 1, 1932—

Patriotism and Scoundrels (Gösta Langenfelt), pp. 32-41.

Uses and meaning of *patriot*. Continued, Part 2, pp. 117-25.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 161, November 7, 1931—

London Booksellers and Publishers, 1700-1750 (Ambrose Heal), pp. 328-29.

Supplementary notes. Continued November 14, pp. 347-51; November 21, pp. 363-67; November 28, pp. 382-85; December 5, pp. 400-04; December 19, pp. 435-39. Further notes by F. J. H. Darton, W. J. Carlton and H. Bateson, January 16, pp. 46-47.

The History and Bibliography of English Newspapers (L. A. Vidler), p. 337.

Seventeenth century newspapers on loan to the Rye Museum.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 161, November 14—

Sir Samuel Tuke (E. S. de Beer), pp. 345-47.
Genealogical notes.

The Museum (Mabel Seymour), pp. 355-56.

Further note by Marion H. Addington, January 16, pp. 47-48.

John Hall, Shakespeare's Son-in-Law, and Hall of Idlicote (E. St. John Brooks), p. 357.

The Projector of Circulating Libraries (Ambrose Heal), p. 358.
Rival claims of Fancourt and Wright.

November 21—

A New Letter of Charles Lamb (J. H. Birss), p. 363.
Letter to Talfourd in Harvard College Library.

December 12—

Thomas Widows, author of a Woodstock pamphlet (Olybrius), p. 424.
The Just Devil of Woodstock, 1649.

December 26—

Coleridge MSS. (J. H. Birss), p. 461.
Text of letter in Harvard College Library.

Vol. 162, January 9, 1932—

Some Notes on English Etymology (W. E. Collinson), pp. 24-25.
The Authorship of *The Flapper*, 1796 (Walter Graham), p. 25.

January 23—

Some of the Shakespearean Entourage (J. C. Whitebrook), pp. 61-62.
The Mummers' Play (G. E. P. A.), pp. 65-66.
Text of play performed at Eversley, Hants.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. X, October 1931—

Spenser and Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln (Brents Stirling),
pp. 321-28.

A Short Study of the Vowels in the Language of the Shuttleworth
Accounts (1582-1621) (Harold Whitehall), pp. 384-91.

Hayward und Kein Ende (E. P. Kuhl), pp. 392-93.
Corrected version of note printed in July.

The "Copy" for Shakspeare's *Sonnets* (S. A. Tannenbaum),
pp. 393-95.

Etymology as Explanation in Blake (F. E. Pierce), pp. 395-99.

Sonnet CV of *Astrophel and Stella* and *Love's Labour's Lost* (J. M. Purcell), p. 399.

A Note on the Reeve's Prologue (F. Montgomery), pp. 404-05.

Vol. XI, January 1932—

Drummond's Borrowing from Donne (Guy S. Greene), pp. 26-38.

Stage-Directions: A Test for the Playhouse Origin of the First
Quarto *Henry V* (Barbara D. Simison), pp. 39-56.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

The Sources of Massinger's *The Renegado* (Warner G. Rice), pp. 65-75.
Chaucer's Romance Element (Manie G. Cloyd), pp. 89-91.

Percentage of Romance words in different poems.

A Note on Shakespearean Criticism (A. L. Strout), pp. 91-93.
"Christopher North's" criticism ascribed to Campbell.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLVI, December 1931—

Widsið, Vidsförlull, and Some Other Analogues (Margaret Schlauch),
pp. 969-87.

The Parlement of Foules: A New Proposal (Haldeen Braddy),
pp. 1007-19.

The proposed marriage between Richard II and Marie of France in 1477.

The Original of the Ballad "Kinge Arthur's Death" in the Percy
Folio MS. (Charles B. Millican), pp. 1020-24.

A New Text of an Old Ballad (Roberta D. Cornelius), pp. 1025-33.

MS. Version of "King John and the Abbot of Canterbury" in Corpus
Christi College, Oxford.

The Miltonic Simile (James Whaler), pp. 1034-74.

Notes on John Cleveland (S. V. Gapp), pp. 1075-86.

Additional biographical information.

Shaftesbury and the Doctrine of Moral Sense in the Eighteenth
Century (William E. Alderman), pp. 1087-94.

Henry Needler and Shaftesbury (Herbert Drennon), pp. 1095-1106.

Fielding's Satire on Pantomime (Charles W. Nichols), pp. 1107-12.

Shenstone and the Countess of Hertford (Helen S. Hughes),
pp. 1113-27.

The Dating of Shenstone's Letters (James F. Fullington), pp. 1128-36.

Moses Mendelssohn's Relation to English Poetry (George J. ten Hoor),
pp. 1137-65.

The Text of the Percy-Warton Letters (Leah Dennis), pp. 1166-1201.

The Caledonian Muse (Bertrand H. Bronson), pp. 1202-20.

Byron and the Countess Guiccioli (Earl C. Smith), pp. 1221-27.

Byron's letters to Alexander Scott.

Keats's Interest in Politics and World Affairs (Clarence DeWitt
Thorpe), pp. 1228-45.

Hartley Coleridge on his Father (Earl L. Griggs), pp. 1246-52.

Fragments of introduction to *Biographia Literaria*.

Fœmina Vera in Charles Reade's Novels (Emerson G. Sutcliffe),
pp. 1260-79.

The Medieval Background of Swinburne's *The Leper* (Clyde K.
Hyder), pp. 1280-88.

William Ernest Henley's Principles of Criticism (Morris U. Schappes),
pp. 1289-1301.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. IX, December 1931—

Une influence possible de Montaigne sur Shakespeare (*Henry V*, IV. i.)
(Marcel May), pp. 109-26.

Thomas Heywood et le problème de l'adultère, dans *Une femme tuée par la bonté* (Yves Bescou), pp. 127-40.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIX, January 1932—

The Manciple's Prologue (James A. Work), pp. 11-14.

Tumbling Nature's Germens (Walter C. Curry), pp. 15-28.

Note on *Macbeth*, IV. i. 63.

The Wits vs John Partridge, Astrologer (W. A. Eddy), pp. 29-40.

With bibliography of satires against Partridge.

Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in Thomson (R. D. Havens),
pp. 41-52.

Some Unpublished *Wartoniana* (Burns Martin), pp. 53-67.

Letters to Janet Warton, and poems.

Coleridge's Revision of *The Ancient Mariner* (B. R. McElderry, Jr.),
pp. 68-94.

Maga, Champion of Shelley (Alan L. Strout), pp. 95-119.

My Last Duchess (John D. Rea), pp. 120-22.

Source of Browning's characters.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 5, 1931—

Captain Cook's Voyages (Maurice Holmes), p. 866.

Anonymous account of the second voyage, 1776.

Reynolds, the Hoods and Mary Lamb (John M. Turnbull), p. 866.

Swinburne and Saffi (Alice Galimberti), p. 866.

Note by John Purves, November 26, p. 960.

"Macaulay Annotated" (Clement C. J. Webb), p. 866.

Macaulay and Charles Trevelyan.

Barouche-Landau (Austin Cooper), p. 866.

Further description.

— NOVEMBER 12—

Early Readings in *The Prelude* (E. de Selincourt), p. 886.

From one of Dorothy Wordsworth's notebooks.

Celtic Place Names (James B. Johnston), p. 894.

Reply by Allen Mawer and F. M. Stenton, November 19, p. 916.

Justice Gardiner (Gordon Crosse), p. 894.

Note on one of Gardiner's tricks.

The Date of Dryden's Birth (Edward G. Fletcher), p. 894.

A Byron Query (D. M. Spencer), p. 894.

Lines "On the Death of Mrs. Lambton."

— November 19—

Two Letters of William Cowper (Robert A. Pratt), p. 916.

Letters to Newton (4 July, 1780) and Rose (4 October, 1789).

Sunday Travelling (C. Wanklyn), p. 916.

Note on Jane Austen's account of Mr. Elliot. Further note by F. A. Bather, November 26, p. 960; reply by C. Wanklyn, December 3, p. 982.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 26—

The Guisers (James Curle), p. 960.

Account of Guisers in Roxburghshire.

December 3—

Love's Quarrell (Francis Needham), p. 982.

Clue to authorship of play seen by Pepys.

Milton and Pindar (Robert Shafer and Walter MacKellar), p. 982.

December 10—

Dr. Darwin: Born December 12, 1731, pp. 989-90.

The Text of Byron's Letters (D. M. Low), p. 1006.

Byron and "Dr. Rennel" (T. J. Wise and Wasey Sterry), p. 1006.

Shakespeare, Essex and *Richard the Second* (Robert Palk), p. 1006.

Sir Walter Raleigh and *Richard II.* Reply by B. M. Ward, December 31, p. 1053.

Mansfield Park (R. W. Chapman), p. 1006.

Likeness to Cottesbrooke. Further note by F. D. MacKinnon, December 31, p. 1053.

Cobbett and Sterne (William Reitzel), p. 1006.

Reference to American edition of *The Sentimental Journey*.

Rear-Admiral James Burney (T. C. Dale), p. 1006.

Burial at St. Margaret's Westminster.

December 17—

Are There More Chaucer Manuscripts? (Edith Rickert), p. 1028.

Early references to manuscripts now unknown.

Tennyson and Froude (C. W. Brodribb), p. 1028.

Source of Tennyson's *Revenge*. Replies by Geoffrey Callender, December 31, p. 1053, and January 21, p. 44.

Franklin and Johnson (F. M. Smith), p. 1028.

Evidence that Franklin's correspondent was American, not English.

December 24—

Drayton's *Polyolbion* (John Lodge), p. 1041.

Source of Drayton's title. Note by A. C. Southern, January 7, p. 12.

Chesterfield's Letters (Robert Burkitt), p. 1041.

Error in dating.

Dryden's Abortive Opera (George W. Whiting), p. 1041.

MSS. of *The State of Innocence* in the Huntington Library. Further letter, giving descriptions and variant readings, January 14, p. 28.

December 31—

Spenser's First Marriage (Mark Eccles), p. 1053.

Entry in Register of St. Margaret's Westminster for 1579. Further notes on Spenser by Raymond Jenkins, January 7, p. 12, and Douglas Hamer, January 14, p. 28.

Thomas Heywood (A. M. Clark), p. 1053.

Translated from the Weavers to the Vintners?

John Longland (W. G. Hiscock), p. 1053.

Good Friday Sermon, 1535.

"To cast beyond ourselves" (A. F. Bluett), p. 1053.

Note on *Hamlet*, II. i. 112. Reply by Katherine M. Buck, January 7, p. 12.

The Text of Shelley (J. P. Pettegrove), p. 1053.

Julian and Maddalo, 412-14, and Goethe's *Faust*, I, 653-55. Reply by Nowell Smith, January 7, p. 12.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 7, 1932—

Sir Benjamin Keene's Papers (Richard Lodge), p. 11.

Letters to Abraham Castres.

Anna Seward and Dr. Johnson (P. Laithwaite), p. 12.

Marginal notes in copy of Mrs. Piozzi's *Letters*.

— January 14—

Tottel's *Miscellany* and John Hall (Hyder E. Rollins), p. 28.

Identification of two poems by Hall in the *Miscellany*.

Gray and Shenstone (H. H. Brown), p. 28.

Shenstone's *Elegy* XV and Gray's *Elegy*. Replies by Leonard Whibley, January 21, p. 44, and Marjorie Williams, January 28, p. 60.

Premonitions of the Industrial Revolution (R. Fitzgibbon Young), p. 28.

In Shadwell's *Virtuoso*.

— January 21—

Hardy and *N.E.D.* (George G. Loane), p. 44.

Use of words later than that recorded in *N.E.D.*

The Chained Books of All Souls (E. F. Jacob), p. 44.

Early lists of chained books.

Johnson Letters (J. D. Wright), p. 44.

Note on letter in the John Rylands Library.

— January 28—

A *Christmas Carol* (Michael Sadleir), p. 60.

Bibliographical note.

